

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOL. XXVI. NO. 1. JANUARY 1946

"THE HOUND OF HEAVEN": A MEDITATION

THE HOUND OF HEAVEN is recognized to be one of the greatest spiritual classics of our own or any language, even by many who can scarcely feel more comfortable with it at close quarters than they do with the no less belauded *Imitation of Christ*. In form, and even to some extent in theme, it reminds one of the *Canticle of Canticles*, and it bears some affinity to what may be called the mystical application of this latter in the *canticle of St. John of the Cross*. The *Canticle* may appear to us at first contact as almost too luscious and sensuous either for human grace or divine poetry, until with irresistible power it sweeps us upward to another world, and we become aware that what seemed to us too much earthy of the earth is in the music of the spheres the controlled accompaniment to celestial melodies. Francis Thompson likewise upon occasion presents an appearance of extravagance in his language, nor would it be safe to deny that at times it can become more than a mere appearance. Nevertheless he too can attain a dithyrambic sublimity that nowhere manifests itself more powerfully than here. He is "precious" in his choice of words, "precious" in his figures, "precious" in his metre; but insensibly we come to justify all this by transcending it, and find ourselves in a world of song which is verily that of the *Canticle*, listening to a holy chant which is even more closely perhaps that of the *Apocalypse of St. John*, broken into as are both by the King of Kings and Lord of Lords Himself.

If we were to seek a text to prefix to *The Hound*, it could hardly be other than the text from St. John, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." The Hound is in pursuit,

Still with unhurrying chase,
And unperturbèd pace,
Deliberate speed, majestic instancy.

That is one aspect of the history of the soul, of the mutual relations (so to call them for short) of God and man. The poet, like the biblical writers and speakers, not excluding the Divine Master

Himself, urges a partial, though momentous, side of the truth, without delaying to define more accurately its precise place in the complete synthesis, with the restrictions and explanations that must be added, if other scarcely less important but likewise only partial facets of that essentially pure and simple light are not to suffer eclipse. We are not, for example, confronted by that insistent appeal of the rich young man, representing in a manner rather the pursuit after God than by Him, "What do I still lack?"

If there is pursuit, there is flight, wherein is all the anguish of the poem. We have another Jonah, no more fleeing a message to be delivered to others, but a sword that pierces deep his own heart. Is there no escape? Can there be no compromise? The stern refusal of aught save complete and absolute surrender proves to be the only answer possible to infinite Mercy and Love. For the love is acknowledged, even from the beginning; it is not the fear of any terrible chastisement that furnishes the motive of the flight, but rather the immensity, the ruthlessness, nay, the jealousy of that love; for God is a jealous God:

For though I knew His love who followed,
Yet was I sore adread
Lest, having Him, I must have naught beside.

And the final lines set forth the triumph of this love:

Ah, fondest, blindest, weakest,
I am He whom thou seekest:
Thou dravest love from thee, who dravest Me.

The crown of the poem, therefore, is not so much the victory of one greatest and worthiest love over all others, as the discovery that there is no other love, that man can fasten his heart upon nothing, without in some sort fastening it upon Love itself. Thus we are brought to the profound truths of philosophy, that objectively all being reflects the goodness of God, to which it owes its very self, so that to desire that being is to desire in it God, and itself in God: and that subjectively every craving of the human heart for a finite good is penetrated and permeated and explained and only made possible by the limitless (even if in whole or part

unconscious) appetite of the human will for that infinite and all-embracing good which can only be God. Nor should these philosophical truths remain speculative and barren; for (to give no other proof) they are of the very substance of the Contemplation for Love in the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius of Loyola. For in these the soul has endeavoured to cleanse herself of sin and affection for sin in the purgative exercises of the first week: she has followed her divine Guide and Captain, Christ the Lord, in His life, death, resurrection, ascension: whence she learns as the final and supreme lesson to love God as He is, because He is God, though without renouncing the means whereby He has brought her to such a height, and will in large measure (if she be generous) keep her there.

How desperate the fear! How desperate the flight! The flight down the years, the flight twisting to right and left in mental labyrinth, the flight burying itself in tears or laughter, and yet never able to find creature able or willing to screen it from Love so grim: a flight conscious of a great betrayal, yet clinging to puny nothings because aware that otherwise it must yield to the immeasurably Great, the shivering of a soul frightened of that tremendous invitation, “Launch out on to the deep.” And still no shelter found from that shuddering: must life be no more than unquenchable panic?

There appears to be a manner of *crescendo* in the movement of the poem. At first the flight is thoughtless and wild. Time will do it, as he speeds along the great viaduct that leads (as he hopes) to the city of his peace, with the years for arches. Or he would smother the thought of the Pursuer with laughter, yet cannot hold back the tears of agony: some streak of wistful hope crosses his soul, chased all too soon by fear of all that may be latent in surrender. But the Hound of Heaven is all too sure of Himself, there is no thought of flurry or anxiety: He will win, because such is His will; and creatures dare not, cannot resist Him, nor offer any shelter from Him. Only by joining in their service to Him can their help be won.

More urgent therefore the flight, though not more urgent, because so sure, the pursuit. No longer hoping with his own thoughts or fancies to blot out the overwhelming care that is upon him, the victim now seeks release from all creatures, to save him from this tremendous Lover. Courage is still lacking to accept, to plunge into those waters that blind with their caress. Like a

beggar he peers in wistfully through some "little casement parted wide", to see whether he may find some shielding hospitality—but no, not there, rest such as that is forbidden, mere creatures will not, cannot save him, they have no sweetness to offer him, because all has been soured by a power not their own, until such time as he will seek delights at their source. And thus the casement spiritually is clashed against him, and in his wild fancy he despairs of the world and rushes out upon the stars, and beats upon the bars of the stellar world, whose effulgence clangs refusal to his quest, even as the moon yields no more than silvery resonance to his fevered clatter.

Yet not only in the spiritual sphere had the "hearted casement" been clashed upon him. Some memory, surely, must be here of the poor girl who mothered him out of her shameful earnings. "Weakness and confidence," writes Mr. Everard Meynell in the *Life* (p. 82), "humility and reverence, were gifts unknown to her except at his hands, and she repaid them with graces as lovely as a child's, and as unhesitating as a saint's."

O brave, sad, lovingest, tender thing!
And of her own scant pittance did she give,
That I might eat and live:
Then fled, a swift and trackless fugitive.

For he had found friends, and she knew that her intimacy, innocent as it was, could only be a fatal stigma upon him. Here, at least, her love was most true; and she evidently took good care that for all his searchings he should not find her again. This is the most poignant episode in his whole story, and touches us to pray that she too may have found her way to the Saviour's feet.

Still the poet portrays the attempted escape: the cry for the dawn when it was night, for evening when it was day, for such hiding as the floating clouds might afford from the gaze of the tremendous Pursuer. How well the poet must have known the agonized quest after creatures who have it not in their power to satisfy, the dread of that surrender which is life only through a veritable death, the loosening of every hold upon creatures for the trembling surrender to the Creator! We recognize in these lines the record of a shattering experience, not mere poetry but spiritual crisis at an intensity such as comes to few; we almost forget the magic art of the words in the contemplation of a naked

soul. Speed is the thing! Yet what avails speed against Him who is all-present, who watches the start of the race while awaiting already at the goal?

Whither shall I go from thy spirit?

Or whither shall I flee from thy presence?

If I should mount to heaven, thou art there:

And if I should make the nether-world my couch, behold thee there!¹

To cling to the whistling wind, swift and smooth, or again, tempestuously roaring, all is of no avail: no skill in flight can evade the all-wisdom of the pursuit. "Naught shelters thee": it is no longer, "all things betray thee", as though in indignation, for the fugitive has taken it to heart that it is indeed a pursuit by Love. He no longer dares betray, yet refuses to shelter: an eloquent word, "to shelter", signifying such a craving for human love, for a love even of a single human being, and him

Of all man's clotted clay the dingiest clot,

—such a craving that the Divine Lover feels homeless, friendless, while still standing at the door of this heart, knocking without.

And now he seeks no more his creature-refuge "in face of man or maid"—a somewhat surprising renunciation, since he has given but little sign of having sought it there, and we miss a stanza that might have been so penetrating; but it seems that we must read much (as has been done) into his pleading

By many a hearted casement, curtained red,
Trellised with intertwining charities.

Or is it that in the main Francis Thompson was not such a one, that he did not easily seek for sympathy and love from his fellow-mortals? That he could look for it "within the little children's eyes" only because they were still so far from conscious thought and will, still yielding only the natural response to the loving approach? Yet even to these little ones he was a danger, because

¹ Psalm 139.
Vol. xxvi

he was fleeing from God; and they were snatched from him, for fear they should learn to flee with him.

They have but a few lines from him; perhaps even they were too human after all. But he shows himself sensible of the charm, as when he lost "the Daisy-flower":

She went her unremembering way,
She went, and left in me
The pang of all the partings gone,
And partings yet to be.

Or again, in his dying lines:

I fear to love you, Sweet, because
Love's the ambassador of loss.

In the face of this evidence, and so much beside, it may be that we should rather say that the children were too real for him to take them into his verse in just this way: that they could only be the children with whom he most consorted, and that he would not soil even with such fantasies the home which had made him welcome.

However that may be, he turns quickly to a reckless wooing of Nature and Nature's children, to a last forced ecstasy before the final crash, somewhat like the joyful ode in a Greek tragedy. The very metre, shortening more than elsewhere, shortening even twice in three lines to a single word, and again almost at once twice in three lines to four syllables, imparts an eager lilt to the poetry that marks the straining of the spirit. Elsewhere it could be used with other effect, as when the single word "Sighs" in the poem, "Before her Portrait in Youth", is a sigh prolonged enough to fill the line; but in "Any Saint", a line of a syllable or two makes a quick strike of exclamation which adds emphasis to the final-line which follows.

Nature herself is the "Lady-Mother", and he invites "delicate fellowship"—not without success, for so it was done. He became, as it were, one with the "chalice lucent-weeping" of the flower at dawn, one with cloud and sky, with spring and autumn, with evening and morn, laying his heart against the red throbbing of sunset. So beautiful a picture, so beautiful a life it seemed; yet this too was vanity. No answer could come from Nature to his call, no milk of kindness to slake his vast thirst. Like so many, he had

conjured up a Nature to his own image and likeness; but she refused the part. And now, as the drama develops to a crisis—a tragic drama, yet how blissful at the close—the Voice says no more

All things betray thee, who betrayest Me,

as if there might be bitter enmity between Pursuer and pursued :
nor yet,

Naught shelters thee, who wilt not shelter Me,

as though both were seeking to escape from a woe that pressed upon them. But now, as resistance comes to lose its frenzied resolution, a greater treasure comes into view, content, peace, boundless surrender to boundless love.

For surrender has now become inevitable; the stroke must fall, albeit a stroke of love. Nevertheless there is a last interlude, a last burst of expostulation, before all struggle ceases, and there is left only a trembling hope, to be immeasurably fulfilled. His every defence has been shattered, every refuge from his Lord has been proved hollow and false. And now he reviews the past, and what it has brought him, and whither he has come. It is as though he had been asleep, or, half-waking, had seen ever more clearly how much the sleep had cost him. Must we not trace a reference here to the opium which had wrecked, or so nearly wrecked, his life? After the fashion of Samson, he had used his youthful strength to shake down the pillars of his being upon his own head; now, mangled, grimy, his youth lies dead beneath the weight of years that have crashed upon it. And he changes to the Psalmist; his days have gone up in smoke, they have puffed up and burst like the bubbles that appear upon a rippling stream broken by rocks or wind, and flash back the bright sun for a moment, only to sink again into smooth nothingness. Such at least seems to be the meaning of “sun-starts”, one of those words which the exuberant fancy of the poet seems to have fashioned for the occasion, without regard for dictionaries.

Now the dream of the dreamer helps him no more, not the lute of the lute-player, not wild fancies wherewith he could play with the world as with a trinket at his wrist, but which now prove cords no longer able to support the griefs of such a world. Ah!

Must the love of the Divine Lover be so devastating as to kill all but itself, like some destructive weed—yet itself a weed that knows no decay? May not the Divine Artist work out His design save with charcoal from the burning? For such indeed the victim has become, his freshness scattered in the dust, his heart a broken fountain from which the tears trickle over from a soul sighing and shuddering. If such he be now, how can he endure the consummation? This is no more than is the less bitter pulp to the taste; as dreadful as the rind will be the final horror!

All too dim, wrapped in mists of time, is his understanding of the divine plan and the Planner; nevertheless, as he nerves himself little by little for the great surrender which he sees upon him, a vision, a sound, manifest themselves once and again "from the hid battlements of Eternity", and ere those mists close again about the heavenly city, he has beheld at long last His Challenger, whose name he knows so well, robed in garments and crown that speak of royal sorrow. And he understands the challenge. But can the Divine Husbandman draw naught from the soil of human heart and human life, unless He first dung it with death and rottenness? Can He only work upon such utter devastation? Unbidden, the Cross rises to the mind; man must live to die, and die to live.

And now the Voice will speak: no longer the short sentence, that sweeps aside the barriers of self-defence, of self-pity, of self-love, but the clear and shattering answer to the miserable perplexity, an engulfing ocean of sound from which there is no avenue of escape. Yes, his earth is indeed marred and shattered to fragments, in which there seemed for a while to be some hope of refuge: what then? Why indeed should it, how could it, afford refuge? How could the creature shelter man from the Creator? More than this—for the attack is pressed home—why should any mortal offer love to such a "strange, piteous, futile thing"? Mere human love must be won by human merit; and how has *he* merited? We feel the poignant shame of the poet, as he digs deeper into his own disgrace and sin. Surely this is a very abyss of humiliation and humility, wherein he sees in himself

Of all man's clotted clay the dingiest clot,

and attempts to plumb the depths of his own unworthiness. To such lowliness the divine answer is sure; it is of such nothingness

that the Divine Power alone can and will make much, loving above all the confessed unworthiness of the creature.

So then naught is lost; for it was taken away, not to inflict pain or damage, but to be found again in the treasures of Divine Love. The foolish child has missed the toy and weeps; but it is to be recovered in his Heavenly Father's arms, with more and to spare. All that is needed is to arise, to grasp that affectionate hand, and follow whithersoever it lead.

The hand indeed is there, waiting to caress; the pursuit has halted, and slowly the stricken fugitive turns, incredulous in wonder, as it comes home to him that his dark night has been but the manner of divine wooing: foolish he has been, blind, weak, yet unawares he was seeking that which he fled, and driving love from him, when Love Himself—for God is Love—had chosen him.

CUTHBERT LATTEY, S.J.

PSALLERE CUM INTELLEGENCIA

"**P**OOOR fellow. He has the burden of the priesthood without its consolations." So a priest was heard to remark at the sight of a subdeacon reading his breviary. This view of the divine office as a burden is by no means uncommon among the clergy. The daily obligation of reciting the Office is looked upon as a sort of mental treadmill; so many Latin words have to be pronounced every day, for the most part without understanding. It is a duty imposed by the Church and therefore to be carried out in obedience and with a good intention; but no spiritual advantage is expected from it, other than the merit acquired by performing a distasteful task.

It does not require much reflection to perceive that this theory is both incredible and intolerable in itself and contrary to the pronouncements of the Holy See and the teaching of spiritual writers. The Psalter is the heart and substance of the Office, and there can be no doubt that the Church wants us to read the psalmist's words with understanding, and make his thoughts and aspirations our own. But as everyone who attempts it soon learns

from experience, this is not at all easy to accomplish, because of the defects in our present Vulgate translation. In the seminaries and in clergy retreats the clergy are frequently exhorted to study commentaries on the psalms. Those who do so find that the Hebrew original is in many places entirely different from the Latin which they have to recite, and that while the obscurity of the psalm is sometimes due to the corruption of the original Hebrew text, in by far the majority of cases it is due to a mis-translation. Studying the commentaries, therefore, does not provide a remedy; because it is impossible for the average mind to remember the sense of the original when he is reading a version which bears no resemblance to it. And even in those psalms which are for the most part intelligible in our present version, here and there a verse will occur which has no connexion with what precedes or follows; the mind is distracted and irritated and loses hold of the main theme of the psalm.

Before the reform of the Breviary by Pius X in 1911 only a very small portion of the Psalter was familiar to the clergy. An Office from the common or proper of the Saints was recited on the great majority of both Sundays and weekdays, and the psalms chosen for these Offices were usually easy reading. The reform brought the whole Psalter again into use; it was a great and most welcome enrichment of the Office, it meant the recovery of many beauties, but also the addition of much that was hopelessly obscure, and so the need for a revised translation was felt much more acutely than before.

It was, therefore, a great joy to all who desire to recite their Office with attention and profit to hear that the Holy Father had authorized for private and public recitation a new version of the Psalter made by the Professors of the Biblical Institute from the Hebrew Text, taking account of all the discoveries of the most recent research. The Holy Father declares in his *Motu proprio* that it is now possible to make a translation of the psalms which will show their meaning so clearly that priests reciting the divine Office will be able to perceive without difficulty what the Holy Spirit wished to signify through the words of the psalmist and will be incited by these divine words to true and genuine piety. He hopes for great spiritual fruits from the use of this new translation; he is confident that those bound to the daily Office, both men and women, will henceforth derive from it more abundant light, grace and consolation, and that in these times so difficult for the

Church they will be moved to emulate the models of sanctity that shine so gloriously in the inspired words of the Psalmist.¹

The translators in their preface explain that they have retained the Vulgate in those passages where it faithfully renders the Hebrew original; elsewhere they have used as far as possible words which occur in other parts of the Vulgate Bible. It will be found that there are few verses or even lines in which a change has not been made. The reader who looks through the new version for the first time will be surprised to discover how few of the psalms he recognizes at first sight. But he will find that the loss of words dear to him from old association is abundantly counterbalanced by the gain in intelligibility, and the knowledge that he is reading what the inspired writer intended to say.

So for example in the first psalm of Sunday Compline, familiar to so many laity as well as clergy, there are two verses in the Vulgate version, the 5th and 8th, which interrupt the train of thought; in the new version they link easily with the preceding:

vv. 3, 5: Filii hominum usquequo
gravi corde? . . .
Iracimini et nolite peccare:
quae dicitis in cordibus vestris,
in cubilibus vestris compungi-
mini.

Viri, quousque estis graves corde?
...
Contremiscite et nolite peccare,
recogitate in cordibus vestris,
in cubilibus vestris, et obmutescite.

vv. 7, 8: . . . dedisti laetitiam in
corde meo.
A fructu frumenti, vini, et olei
sui multiplicati sunt.

Dedisti laetitiam in cor meum
majorem, quam cum abundant
tritico et vino.

In the Vulgate version of the *Miserere*, there is a sudden and puzzling change of theme at verse 8. "Ecce enim veritatem dilexisti . . ."; the psalmist appears to turn from the thought of his sinfulness to praise God for loving truth. This is now translated: "Ecce, sinceritate cordis delectaris"; God loves sincerity of heart, that sincerity which is the mark of the true penitent; and so the continuity of thought is unbroken.

In the new version of the *De Profundis* there is no gain in intelligibility, but a new and surely more beautiful meaning is given to the sixth verse, where the soul's yearning for God is compared to the night watcher waiting eagerly for the dawn:

¹ See the full text of the *Motu proprio* in THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1945, XXV, pp. 524-526.

Exspectat anima mea Dominum,
Magis quam custodes auroram,
Magis quam custodes auroram
exspectat Israel Dominum.

There are several bewildering passages in our present version of Psalm 17 (Monday matins) which now read quite simply; for example:

- | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| v. 27: Et cum electo, electus eris:
et cum perverso perverteris. | Erga purum te monstras purum,
erga versutum te praebes pruden-
tem. |
| v. 37: Dilatasti gressus meos subtus
me:
et non sunt infirmata vestigia
mea. | Latam fecisti viam gressibus meis,
Nec vacillarunt pedes mei. |

Other baffling lines in Monday's psalms are now elucidated:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ps. 28, v. 1: Afferte Domino filii
Dei:
afferte Domino filios arietum. | Tribuite Domino, filii Dei,
tribuite Domino gloriam et poten-
tiam. |
| Ps. 31, v. 4: Conversus sum in
aerumna mea dum configitur
spina. | Consumebatur robur meum velut
ardoribus aestivis. |
| Ps. 115, v. 1: Credidi, propter quod
locutus sum:
ego autem humiliatus sum
nimis. | Confisus sum, etiam cum dixi:
Ego afflictus sum valde. |
| Ps. 121, v. 3: Jerusalem, quae
aedificatur ut civitas:
cujus participatio ejus in idip-
sum. | Jerusalem quae aedificata est ut
civitas,
in se compacta tota. |
| Ps. 7, v. 7: Et exsurge Domine Deus
meus in praecepto quod
mandasti. | Et surge pro me in iudicio quod
indixisti. |

Wednesday's office has many difficult passages; for example, verse 6 of Psalm 48 (second nocturn matins):

Cur timebo in die mala?
iniquitas calcanei mei circumdabit me.

Many readers must have wondered how a man could be surrounded by the wickedness of his heel. This now reads quite straightforwardly:

Quare timeam diebus malis, cum
nequitia insidiantium me cir-
cumdat.

Why should I fear in the evil days
when the wickedness of them that
plot against me surrounds me?

Verses 23 and 24 of Psalm 54 (Wednesday terce) in the Vulgate
make no sense at all:

Extendit manum suam in retri-
buendo.

He has stretched forth his hand to
repay.

Contaminaverunt testamentum
ejus:

They have defiled his covenant.

Divisi sunt ab ira vultus ejus:

They are divided by the anger of his
countenance,

et appropinquavit cor illius.

and his heart has drawn near.

Molliti sunt sermones ejus super
oleum:

His words are smoother than oil,

et ipsi sunt jacula.

and the same are darts.

But in the new version they give a vivid picture of the duplicity
of the wicked:

Extendit suas quisque manus contra
familiares suos,

Each one puts forth his hand
against his friends,

Violat pactum suum.

he breaks his covenant.

Blandior butyro est facies ejus,
sed cor ejus pugnax.

His face is smoother than butter,
but his heart is warlike.

Molliores oleo sunt sermones ejus,
sed sunt gladii stricti.

His words are softer than oil,
but they are drawn swords.

Compare the two versions of the beautiful little twenty-second
psalm. We shall regret losing the sonorous Latin of "Nam et si
ambulavero in medio umbrae mortis, non timebo mala quoniam
tu mecum es" and "et calix meus inebrians quam praeclarus est";
but who can doubt that the new version more faithfully reproduces
the psalmist's meaning?

Dominus regit me et nihil mihi
deerit:

Dominus pascit me: nihil mihi
deest;

in loco pascuae ibi me collocavit.

in pascuis virentibus cubare me facit.

Super aquam refectionis educavit
me;

Ad aquas, ubi quiescam, conducit
me,

animam meam convertit.

reficit animam meam.

Deduxit me super semitas justitiae,
propter nomen suum.

Deducit me per semitas rectas
propter nomen suum.

Nam et si ambulavero in medio
umbrae mortis,

Etsi incedam in valle tenebrosa,

non timebo mala: quoniam tu
mecum es.

non timebo mala, quia tu mecum
es.

Virga tua et baculus tuus:
ipsa me consolata sunt.

Virga tua et baculus tuus:
haec me consolantur.

Parasti in conspectu meo mensam,
adversus eos qui tribulant me.
Impinguasti in oleo caput meum:
et calix meus inebrians quam
praeclarus est:

Et misericordia tua subsequetur
me omnibus diebus vitae meae.
Et ut inhabitem in domo Domini,
in longitudinem dierum.

Paras mihi mensam
spectantibus adversariis meis.
Inungis oleo caput meum;
calix meus uberrimus est.

Benignitas et gratia me sequentur
cunctis diebus vitae meae.
Et habitabo in domo Domini,
in longissima tempora.

There are a few instances in which the change from the Vulgate is merely verbal, and appears hardly consistent with the translators' declared intention to retain the ancient text wherever possible; for example:

Ps. 112, v. 9: Sterilem in domo
Ps. 126, v. 2: Frustra vigilat qui
custodit eam.

Ps. 77, v. 7: et non obliviscantur
operum Dei.

Ps. 77, v. 22: quia non crediderunt
in Deo.

quae sterilis erat in domo.
in vanum vigilat custos.

neque obliviscantur opera Dei.

quia non crediderunt in Deum.

It must also be admitted that the Latin of the new version is not so concise or so well-balanced as the old. Sometimes the lines are definitely cumbersome; for example, the second half of verse 16, Psalm 138:

Actus meus viderunt oculi tui,
et in libro tuo scripti sunt omnes;
dies sunt definiti, priusquam esset vel unus ex eis.

Or Ps. 30, v. 14:

Etenim audiui sibilum multorum; terror est undique.
Convenientes simul contra me, vitam meam auferre meditati sunt.

Such lines will not be easy to recite in choir.

The Vatican Press is preparing an edition of the new version arranged according to the Psalter of the Roman Breviary. When this has been published it may be used for either the private or public recitation of the Office. The present edition contains, besides the translation, some helps towards the study of the Psalter for the use of priests and others bound to recite the Office. The prolegomena provide a description of the different classes of psalms, and some notes about the titles and authors and the

principle texts and translations. To each psalm is prefixed a brief summary of its contents, and short explanatory notes of difficult words and phrases are given at the foot of the page. Unfortunately copies are at present unobtainable in England, owing to the restrictions on imports, which seem likely to continue for some time; and this is the principal reason why we have tried here to give the clergy an idea of its contents. It is to be hoped that some enterprising publishers will undertake an English edition.

G. L. SMITH.

THE ORIGINS OF FREEMASONRY

THE EARLY BRETHREN

THE gathering at which the Grand Lodge of England was founded on 24 June, 1717, was not attended by any person of note and only in retrospect can its importance be appreciated. For a reason we do not know the brethren elected as Grand Master, one, Anthony Sayer, "gentleman", an official of the Customs House, and called on him to fill the chair occupied in our own day by princes of the royal blood. About 1721 the nobility began to stream into the order. The first peer to be Grand Master was the second Duke of Montagu, Marlborough's son-in-law, a nobleman with a taste for practical jokes, who put things into the beds of his guests to make them itch. But he had a more serious side to his character and was a patron of medicine. Montagu in his own person illustrates the peculiar character of the appeal which masonry was able to make. It attracted at the same time men of serious mind no less than the drunkard and the libertine. It drew the former by its philosophical appeal; the latter, by its convivial aspects. In its capacity to draw different classes of men has lain the source of its strength. If Freemasonry had failed to attract men of high intellectual endowments it would have been without influence; if it had been able to offer no inducement to the frivolous it would have grown weak through lack of numbers.

After the Evangelical revival English Freemasonry came to include in its membership many earnest Christians; but in its early

years it made a stronger appeal to men whose ethical code may be spoken of as that of the higher paganism. Benjamin Franklin may be taken as representative of the type of man who took masonry seriously and as a sort of substitute for Christianity, though at first he spoke slightly of it in the *Pennsylvania Gazette*. In his *Autobiography* he has mapped out the course of conduct he proposed to pursue when he "conceived the bold and arduous course of arriving at perfection". Franklin's code found expression in such resolutions as these: "eat not to dullness; drink not to elevation"; "speak not but what may benefit others or yourself"; "be always employed in something useful"; "use no hurtful deceit"; "forbid resenting injuries so much as you think they deserve"; "tolerate no uncleanness in body, clothes or habitation". The twelfth resolution did not forbid occasional unchastity when the interests of health were supposed to require it, but never when it led to loss of peace of mind or of reputation by either of the parties. A Quaker friend pointed out that Franklin's code contained nothing about humility, so the author added a further resolution, "Imitate Jesus and Socrates".

English Freemasonry was introduced into France about 1721. It was not, however, to men who troubled themselves about "arriving at perfection" that it made its strongest appeal, though, as in England, masonry was deistic in character. Perhaps what drew most recruits was the secrecy which surrounded the ritual and the social advantages which it offered. It was only at a much later date that entrance into the order was sought for professional advancement. The most interesting figure in French Freemasonry during the first half of the eighteenth century is the Chevalier Ramsay, a Scotsman, who had been received into the Church by Fénelon, but later became a deist. Ramsay defined the principles of the order as *la philanthropie, la morale pure, le secret inviolable et le goût des beaux-arts*.

Lord George Sackville, afterwards second Duke of Dorset, is credited with having introduced Freemasonry into Italy. Lodges were in existence in Rome and in Florence soon after 1730 and quickly fell under the suspicion of the authorities. When Horace Mann arrived in Florence as British envoy in 1737, he found persons being arrested by the Inquisition on the charge of associating "with the English and with Freemasonry". One of the causes of the spread of the order was the way in which it broke down social distinctions. Inside the lodge the aristocrat had to associate as an

equal with a lawyer, a doctor or an army officer, whom he would have regarded with disdain in ordinary life. This levelling tendency was as noticeable in the Germanic countries as in France; and in Sweden Gustavus III is said actually to have used Freemasonry as a means of promoting to positions of influence men who were not of noble birth. It should also be remembered that in communities in which political liberty was non-existent secret societies provided an outlet for much of the energy which would in other conditions have been devoted to political activities. The rapidity with which Freemasonry spread over Europe was astonishing, and is to be accounted for by the spirit of scepticism then prevailing. In abandoning belief in the Christian revelation man did not get rid of his innate craving for membership of a church and sought satisfaction for it both in the ritual and in the spirit of brotherhood provided by the lodge. In many countries it was assisted by its dynastic connexions, notably in Germany, where Freemasonry was introduced in 1733, when a lodge at Hamburg was founded by deputation from the Grand Lodge of England. The Prince Royal of Prussia (afterwards Frederick the Great) was initiated at Brunswick in 1738 by a deputation from Hamburg. He became Grand Master of the "Three Globes" (*Zu den drei Weltkugeln*) Lodge in Berlin, but in later years took little interest in Freemasonry.

The order grew popular in Catholic, no less than in Protestant Germany, having a distinguished initiate in the Emperor Francis I. Reference was made in the preceding article to his initiation, as Duke of Lorraine. This event, which had considerable political significance, took place at The Hague when Lord Chesterfield was ambassador. The ceremony was performed by a deputation from London headed by Dr. Désaguliers. Soon afterwards the future emperor visited England and was made a master mason at Houghton Hall, Norfolk, the seat of Sir Robert Walpole, where an emergency meeting of the "Maid's Head" Lodge of Norwich had been called for the purpose. Sir Robert was initiated on the same occasion.

The traditional conservatism of Russia did not hinder Freemasonry from becoming at one time extremely popular, though it had powerful enemies, particularly among those who were opposed to "westernization". It has been claimed that in Russia masonry had an especial attraction for men who were interested in moral reform. Though it belongs to a somewhat later period, i.e. the

early part of the reign of Alexander I, the description given by Tolstoy in *War and Peace* of a masonic initiation in Russia is interesting. The lodge meets in a large private mansion in St. Petersburg. The candidate, Pierre, is kept waiting outside, with bandaged eyes, while his hands swell and his legs tremble. He is then admitted to a dark room and is unblindfolded. The room is lit by a shrine-lamp burning in a skull. It contains also a coffin filled with bones and the book of the Gospels open at St. John i. The candidate says that he seeks regeneration; he is instructed by an officer called the "rhetor" in the chief aims of the craft and makes a sort of confession to him. He is again blindfolded and led into a second room. When the bandage is removed he sees a dozen men wearing masonic emblems seated at a table covered with black. Some of them he recognizes, as having met in St. Petersburg society, and among them is an Italian ecclesiastic. This room contains an altar with seven candles upon it, before which Pierre prostrates himself. He is then given three pairs of gloves and a white apron which must never be sullied, as it is the emblem of purity and strength. A trowel is put into the initiate's hand, as the Worshipful Master tells him that it is to be used for eradicating faults from his own heart and laying the foundations of virtue in the hearts of his neighbours. The initiate is not to understand the significance of the first pair of gloves, which are men's; the second pair, also men's, are to be worn in the lodge. The third pair are women's gloves and their reception is accompanied by the command "Give them to the woman whom you reverence above all others." The Worshipful Master, having exhorted Pierre to make no distinctions that tend to destroy equality, embraces him and raps on the table with a mallet. Someone reads an address on humility and the proceedings close with a collection of alms. To what extent this account is an accurate representation of Russian Freemasonry of the period, or whether or no Tolstoy has drawn on his imagination, it is impossible to say.

Even in the eighteenth century the claim of Freemasonry to be a universal brotherhood of mankind was not merely an academic one. In 1775 a Protestant minister named Prince Hall established a lodge for Negroes at Boston, though a section of Anglo-Saxon masonry has always doubted whether the black man possesses the requisite qualities demanded of an initiate.

To look at the matter from a natural point of view only, it can be easily seen that, as a rival to Christianity, Freemasonry,

whether considered as a religion or a philosophy, is handicapped by the exclusion, at least in its more orthodox forms, of women from its mysteries. English Freemasonry preserves the tradition, be it fact or fiction, of the initiation of the Hon. Mrs. Aldworth, daughter of Lord Doneraile, who as a young lady had succeeded in coming to the knowledge of its secrets; and the masons of Hungary tell a similar story about Countess Hadik Barkoczy. But not till the time of Mrs. Annie Besant did female importunities give the English craft cause for genuine anxiety. In France the matter was different and scarcely had the fraternity been introduced into that country, than ladies were entreating their husbands and their lovers to disclose to them the masonic secrets.

Italian women were not less interested in them than their French sisters. In his comedy *Le Donne Curiose* Goldoni satirizes the prevalent suspicion of Freemasonry. The scene is laid in Bologna. The inquisitive ladies bribe Brighella, a maid of Pantaleone, the Master of the lodge, to conceal them in such a manner that they are able to overhear the proceedings during a séance. The lodge turns out to be nothing but a harmless dining-club from which women are to be for ever excluded, "lest there arise scandals, dissensions and jealousies".

Exactly how women obtained an entrance into Freemasonry does not seem to be quite clear. The masonic historian, Gaston Martin, conjectures that female masonry was originally started as a parody of the male variety. But it is possible that feminine inquisitiveness proved so persistent that the brethren decided that the best thing to do was to meet the women halfway and let them have lodges of their own. Be that as it may, we find in the years preceding the Revolution lodges admitting both sexes, and also lodges for women only. The former, found in Italy as well, had a bad moral reputation. On 1 September, 1775, the masons at Naples initiated a young woman who, on the following day, exhibited symptoms of a grave malady to which she shortly afterwards succumbed. The public attributed her death to the effects of initiation and, on the 12th of the same month, King Ferdinand prohibited masonic meetings in Naples under the most extreme penalty. Of greater interest are the so-called "Lodges of Adoption" or lodges for women only, which arose in France and were admitted to official recognition.¹ The ritual was somewhat different from that in use in the lodges for men; but in the main they were

¹ These lodges were under the supervision of the male lodges.

organized on the same lines possessing three symbolic degrees, *apprentisses*, *compagnonnes* and *maîtresses*. The "Noachite" influence, referred to in the previous article, is observable in the rite for the initiation of an *apprentisse*. On the carpet of the lodge were depicted the ark floating on the waves, the Tower of Babel, and Jacob's ladder, which last signified in the Cabbala the just man whose feet are on earth while his head is in heaven. On the table was a representation of an apple-tree covered with fruit, with a serpent coiled round it, and Adam and Eve on either side. The candidate was asked whether she had given herself to the reflexion necessary before seeking entrance into so venerable an order and whether she had ever believed the sisters to be addicted to infamous vices. If she replied affirmatively to the second question there was a pause till an expression of contrition had been elicited. The initiate then removed her left garter and received in place a blue riband. An idea of the popularity of the lodges of Adoption may be gathered from the fact that the Duchesse de Bourbon and the Princesse de Lamballe successively occupied the position of *grande maîtresse*, and that in 1781 we find Marie-Antoinette declaring that all the ladies of her court belonged to them. Female masonry did not survive the Revolution and women virtually disappear from masonic history till the foundation of the *maçonnerie mixte* at the beginning of the present century.

As favouring "Indifferentism" in religious matters it was inevitable that sooner or later Freemasonry should fall under the ban of the Church. In 1737 the lodge in Rome was closed by the Holy Office and in the following year Clement XII pronounced the first of the papal condemnations of Freemasonry. A second condemnation was issued by Benedict XIV thirteen years later, occasioned, so it is said, by the number of pilgrims coming to Rome for the Jubilee of 1750 who sought absolution from the censures incurred by those who had entered the order. The social attractions it offered were, however, keenly felt by Catholics and in Germany some of them sought to console themselves for their loss by founding a parody of Freemasonry, the *Mopsorden* or "Order of Pug-dogs", this animal being looked on as a symbol of fidelity. The Elector of Cologne, Archbishop Klemens August of Bavaria, was a leading promoter of this movement.

More difficult to understand is the way in which Freemasonry drew into its ranks many of the Catholic clergy. Exaggerated statements have been made with regard to this point. It is some-

times asserted that all, or nearly all, the great churchmen of the period preceding the Revolution were freemasons, a judgement which we can certainly dismiss. Nor need we take more seriously the allegation that Pope Benedict XIV himself was a mason, a belief which may have perhaps had its genesis in the fact that a lodge, run by some Englishmen in Italy, humorously elected him as master. But that a considerable number of the clergy entered the order there is no doubt, and this fact is more easily understood when it is remembered that the Freemasonry of those days, while attracting men of a sceptical turn of mind, lacked the actively anti-religious character which the order took on in many countries at a later date. If we wish to find a contemporary parallel to eighteenth-century Freemasonry on the Continent, we should probably best find it in Bulgaria on the eve of the War. Monsieur Albert Lantoine, one of the chief luminaries of the *Grande Loge* of France and a free-thinker, visited the Balkans a few years ago with the object of improving political relations between Yugoslavia and Bulgaria through the instrumentality of Freemasonry, and in his *L'Abdication du Soleil* he has described the condition of the craft in the latter country. In Sofia he found that the lodge, which had been blessed by a "pope" of the Bulgarian Church, was under the patronage of a local saint. In it he was presented to one of the spiritual chiefs of the Mohammedan community and he learned that the initiation of the Orthodox Archbishop was shortly expected to take place. But what gave Lantoine more surprise than anything else was that, when visiting the Cathedral of St. Alexander Nevsky in the company of a masonic professor from the University, the latter paused to light two candles for the repose of the soul of his mother lately dead. One could not imagine, he remarks, a university professor who was a freemason doing such a thing in France.

Something like this was Freemasonry in Western and Central Europe in the eighteenth century. Masons had commemoration masses said for deceased brethren and there is an instance of a masonic function at Brussels, opening with a solemn requiem at the Church of the Recollects, to which the brethren of Alost were invited. When the masons of Toul were condemned by their bishop in 1770 they addressed him a document in which they prayed that God would deign to shed the light of His Holy Spirit upon him, accord him His holy benediction, and one day render him worthy to become a freemason. I have seen a French masonic manuscript

organized on the same lines possessing three symbolic degrees, *apprentisses*, *compagnonnes* and *maîtresses*. The "Noachite" influence, referred to in the previous article, is observable in the rite for the initiation of an *apprentisse*. On the carpet of the lodge were depicted the ark floating on the waves, the Tower of Babel, and Jacob's ladder, which last signified in the Cabbala the just man whose feet are on earth while his head is in heaven. On the table was a representation of an apple-tree covered with fruit, with a serpent coiled round it, and Adam and Eve on either side. The candidate was asked whether she had given herself to the reflexion necessary before seeking entrance into so venerable an order and whether she had ever believed the sisters to be addicted to infamous vices. If she replied affirmatively to the second question there was a pause till an expression of contrition had been elicited. The initiate then removed her left garter and received in place a blue riband. An idea of the popularity of the lodges of Adoption may be gathered from the fact that the Duchesse de Bourbon and the Princesse de Lamballe successively occupied the position of *grande maîtresse*, and that in 1781 we find Marie-Antoinette declaring that all the ladies of her court belonged to them. Female masonry did not survive the Revolution and women virtually disappear from masonic history till the foundation of the *maçonnerie mixte* at the beginning of the present century.

As favouring "Indifferentism" in religious matters it was inevitable that sooner or later Freemasonry should fall under the ban of the Church. In 1737 the lodge in Rome was closed by the Holy Office and in the following year Clement XII pronounced the first of the papal condemnations of Freemasonry. A second condemnation was issued by Benedict XIV thirteen years later, occasioned, so it is said, by the number of pilgrims coming to Rome for the Jubilee of 1750 who sought absolution from the censures incurred by those who had entered the order. The social attractions it offered were, however, keenly felt by Catholics and in Germany some of them sought to console themselves for their loss by founding a parody of Freemasonry, the *Mopsorden* or "Order of Pug-dogs", this animal being looked on as a symbol of fidelity. The Elector of Cologne, Archbishop Klemens August of Bavaria, was a leading promoter of this movement.

More difficult to understand is the way in which Freemasonry drew into its ranks many of the Catholic clergy. Exaggerated statements have been made with regard to this point. It is some-

times asserted that all, or nearly all, the great churchmen of the period preceding the Revolution were freemasons, a judgement which we can certainly dismiss. Nor need we take more seriously the allegation that Pope Benedict XIV himself was a mason, a belief which may have perhaps had its genesis in the fact that a lodge, run by some Englishmen in Italy, humorously elected him as master. But that a considerable number of the clergy entered the order there is no doubt, and this fact is more easily understood when it is remembered that the Freemasonry of those days, while attracting men of a sceptical turn of mind, lacked the actively anti-religious character which the order took on in many countries at a later date. If we wish to find a contemporary parallel to eighteenth-century Freemasonry on the Continent, we should probably best find it in Bulgaria on the eve of the War. Monsieur Albert Lantoine, one of the chief luminaries of the *Grande Loge* of France and a free-thinker, visited the Balkans a few years ago with the object of improving political relations between Yugoslavia and Bulgaria through the instrumentality of Freemasonry, and in his *L'Abdication du Soleil* he has described the condition of the craft in the latter country. In Sofia he found that the lodge, which had been blessed by a "pope" of the Bulgarian Church, was under the patronage of a local saint. In it he was presented to one of the spiritual chiefs of the Mohammedan community and he learned that the initiation of the Orthodox Archbishop was shortly expected to take place. But what gave Lantoine more surprise than anything else was that, when visiting the Cathedral of St. Alexander Nevsky in the company of a masonic professor from the University, the latter paused to light two candles for the repose of the soul of his mother lately dead. One could not imagine, he remarks, a university professor who was a freemason doing such a thing in France.

Something like this was Freemasonry in Western and Central Europe in the eighteenth century. Masons had commemoration masses said for deceased brethren and there is an instance of a masonic function at Brussels, opening with a solemn requiem at the Church of the Recollects, to which the brethren of Alost were invited. When the masons of Toul were condemned by their bishop in 1770 they addressed him a document in which they prayed that God would deign to shed the light of His Holy Spirit upon him, accord him His holy benediction, and one day render him worthy to become a freemason. I have seen a French masonic manuscript

dating from this period which contains discourses suitable to be pronounced at the initiation of a bishop, an Augustinian canon, a lay-brother and an advocate of the Court of Rome. If the free-masons of the following century would have counselled a priest to apostatize, those of this period would have sought to persuade him that he would be a better priest if he became one of themselves.

The number of ecclesiastical masons has received the attention both of masonic and non-masonic writers. Professor Nys, the Belgian jurisconsult and freemason, estimates that there were perhaps 400 in Europe in the latter part of the eighteenth century.¹ Of the 629 French lodges of the Grand Orient rite which were in existence when the Revolution began, in 27 (5 in Paris and 22 in the provinces), the chair was filled by an ecclesiastic.² But the total proportion of priests and clerics in the order was far less than four per cent, these tending to be more numerous among the officers than among the rank and file of the freemasons. In the lodge *Union* at Laval, in 1789, three of the five officers, the master, the warden and the orator, were priests. The orders and congregations were perhaps better represented in the lodges than the secular clergy. Into the Breton lodge of the *Parfaite Union* at Rennes a dozen members of the regular clergy were initiated between 1775 and 1785. They included the priors of the Benedictines and Augustinians, the corrector of the Minims, and the procurator of the Dominicans. An Oratorian was worshipful master (*vénérable*) of a lodge at Nantes. Two abbés, advocates of the parlement of Paris, were along with Franklin and Voltaire members of the famous lodge of the *Neuf Soeurs*. It is uncertain whether any ecclesiastical masons were elected by the clergy to the Estates-General in 1789. Talleyrand and Sieyès were both masons, but they were elected by the Third Estate.

Père van der Schelden estimates that forty priests were in-

¹ The earliest reference I have come across to alleged participation of the Catholic clergy in Freemasonry is so strange as to suggest that there has been some misunderstanding. An American news-sheet, the *Weekly Rehearsal* of Boston, in its issue of 19 February, 1732-3, contains under the heading of "News from Paris" the following: "On Monday his Excellency [the Nuncio] being a FREE MASON, is to lay the first stone towards the building of the great altar in the Church of Saint Sulpice" (quoted from *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, XXXII, 1919, p. 173). It is true that this was before the first papal bull against the Freemasons; but still it is incredible that the Pope's representative would join a secret society of free-thinking tendencies, recently introduced into France from England, and moreover allow it to be publicly known that he had done so. If the statement has any foundation in fact at all, we may conjecture that the Nuncio was perhaps patron of a confraternity of builders.

² Gaston Mastin, *La Franc-Maçonnerie et la préparation de la Révolution*, p. 29.

initiated in Belgium under the Austrian regime.¹ He is somewhat sceptical about the story that von Welbruck, the encyclopaedist Prince-Bishop of Liège, belonged to the lodge of the *Parfaite Intelligence* in that city. Robison, the Edinburgh professor, whose revelations about Freemasonry made such a stir in England at the time of the French Revolution, says that the whole chapter belonged to this lodge and that he himself was initiated by the Bishop in his palace. That all the canons of Liège were masons seems scarcely probable, and no record exists of the initiation even of the Bishop; but the tradition that he was a mason is a very strong one, and, if he were, he would naturally be anxious that the fact should not be known in Rome, and so may have caused evidence of it to be destroyed. At all events, even if he were not actually a mason, he was a friend of the order and defended the brethren of Aix-la-Chapelle, when fiercely assailed from the pulpit by two friars.²

Nor did Freemasonry fail to gain, at least, a few recruits among the Italian clergy. There is some evidence that, when the Inquisition began to take action for its suppression in Tuscany, two canons of the Duomo and possibly some other ecclesiastics were members of a lodge in Florence.

As regards the German states, the Catholic Reichsrat, Dr. von Fuchs, estimated in 1897 that there were 185 ecclesiastical masons in Austria under Joseph II. Two imperial and royal chaplains, two canons and the Rector of a seminary are said to have been members of a lodge in Vienna. Dom Urban Hauer, Abbot of the great Benedictine monastery of Melk on the Danube, is alleged not only to have been a mason, but to have initiated many of his monks and to have been eventually buried in his masonic regalia, which last detail is probably an exaggeration. In Bavaria a priest named Hertel joined the masonic sect of the "Illuminati" about which there has been so much interest of late years. He became a member of its "Areopagus" or supreme council and was known as "Marius" (the members assumed classical names). According to the Abbé Barruel the Illuminati rewarded him for his services by procuring for him a canonry at

¹ *La Franc-Maçonnerie Belge sous le régime autrichien (1721-1794)*, p. 302.

² Further, Ludwig Greinemann, a Dominican, is reported to have said that Judas used the thirty pieces of silver as his fee for initiation into a masonic lodge of which Pilate and Herod were wardens. Father Peter Schiff, a Capuchin, is said to have outdone his colleague in vituperation of the fraternity. It was credulity of this sort which did so much in later times to cast discredit on the Catholic opponents of Freemasonry.

Munich. In the Rhineland the "Three Thistles" Lodge at Mainz made an especial effort to seek recruits among the Catholic clergy. Karl Theodor von Dalberg, Co-adjutor to Erthal, the last Elector of Mainz, was a freemason. He was the only prelate to benefit by Napoleon's re-organization of the German territories and became Primate of the Confederation of the Rhine. Inside the lodge the Archbishop was known as "Brother Crescent". Most notorious of the German ecclesiastical masons of the age was Count Philipp Gotthard von Schaffgotsch, co-adjutor to Cardinal Sinzendorf, Prince-Bishop of Breslau, and later his successor. Schaffgotsch, a gay young nobleman and intimate friend of Frederick the Great, was initiated into the lodge of the "Three Skeletons" at Breslau, and is said later to have assisted at the foundation of that of the "Three Canons" in the same city. For some years after his ordination he led an immoral life and went to balls dressed as a layman. Anxious to secure a pliant successor to Cardinal Sinzendorf, the greater part of whose diocese was now in Prussia, the King forced Schaffgotsch on him as co-adjutor in spite of the protests of the Chapter. He seems at this period to have begun to manifest some indications of change of life, but he continued to cause disedification. Once at a dinner the Bishop removed his pectoral cross and dipped it into his wine, saying with profane jocosity, "It is not fitting for the servant to drink without the master"; which impiety, says Benedict XIV, shocked even the Lutheran officers who were present. The Cardinal died in 1747 and Schaffgotsch, anxious to succeed to the see, sent an emissary to Rome to say that he had now amended his life. The Pope instructed the Nuncio in Warsaw to ascertain whether there were grounds for hoping that Schaffgotsch's repentance was sincere, and eventually allowed him to take possession of his see, while giving him some paternal advice. The decision proved to have been a wise one; for Schaffgotsch during his long episcopate of forty-seven years, was a better bishop than the unpromising beginnings of his priestly life would have suggested. His zeal even led him to incur the displeasure of Frederick, the friend of his youth, and he was for a time compelled to retire to the part of his diocese which was still in Austrian territory.

One case of a Jesuit freemason, Father Lorenz Leopold, is mentioned by Lennhof (*The Freemasons*, p. 290); but a large proportion of the initiations of the clergy would have occurred after the suppression of the Society in 1773. Another German

priest who played an important part in the history of Freemasonry was the ex-friar, Ignaz Fessler, reviser of masonic rituals. The craft in Poland did not lack some measure of ecclesiastical support, finding perhaps an adherent, certainly a sympathizer, in Archbishop Podovsky of Gnesen and Posen, who lent the silver used at a masonic banquet in Warsaw on St. John the Baptist's Day, 1770. After the time of Napoleon the number of Catholic clerics who entered Freemasonry became very small. Franz Liszt is claimed as one of them, but his initiation at the "Unity" Lodge at Frankfort-on-the-Main took place twenty-four years before he received the tonsure. A certain number of priests in the Iberian peninsula do, however, seem to have been freemasons at the time of the civil wars,¹ and a few in Italy during the period of the *Risorgimento*. A canon named Anghera took a prominent part in founding lodges in South Italy. Fra Giovanni, a Capuchian who placed himself at Garibaldi's disposal as a chaplain at the time of the Sicilian expedition, applied for membership of a lodge *Fede Italica*. On his application form he described himself as "an adherent of the universal priesthood of the freedom of nations".

The last serious scandal of this nature was probably that which occurred in 1904 when it became known that a member of the diocesan Chapter at Dijon had discovered that the ordinary, Mgr. Le Nordez, belonged to a masonic lodge. The discovery was all the more startling, in that French Freemasonry had by this time become actively and aggressively anti-religious. The incident played an important part in the train of events which led up to the separation of Church and State in France.²

We may be tempted to account for the fact that, in spite of the reiterated prohibitions of the Church, so many Catholics and even priests entered Freemasonry, by supposing that the social attractions offered by the order proved stronger than the spirit of obedience. Doubtless this was often the case. But two other considerations must be borne in mind. Many Catholics at this period were imbued with regalist ideas and held that the papal bulls only acquired validity, after receiving the *regium placetum*. Curious light is thrown on this matter in some letters addressed in 1778 by

¹ In Portugal masonic functions sometimes were held inside the churches.

² This was the version given by the Catholic press. The modernist ex-priest, Albert Houtin, states that the main evidence for the Bishop's affiliation was a faked photograph (*Une Vie de Prêtre*, i, 335). Le Nordez was a strange man, who on being nominated to a bishopric said that he regarded the episcopate as a social obligation to be discharged in the interests of Humanity.

François de Conzié, Archbishop of Tours, to the notorious Loménie de Brienne, Archbishop of Toulouse and President of the Commission of Regulars. Conzié, in the capacity of royal commissioner, had presided at the chapter of the Franciscans of Touraine at which Père Etienne, a freemason, was unanimously chosen provincial. Conen de Saint-Luc, Bishop of Quimper and an opponent of the Freemasons, was moved to indignation by this, and Conzié in his correspondence refers sarcastically to the Bishop as a rigorist, saying that, since Père Etienne had expressed his intention to see the rule observed, his masonic affinities might be well overlooked.¹

In addition to this it is indisputable that the condemnations of Freemasonry by the Holy See were far from being universally known, though ignorance on this point would have been less common among the clergy than among the laity, and could hardly have been found at all among the bishops. In 1838, the centenary of Clement XII's bull, *In Eminenti Apostolatus Speculâ*, the Belgian Bishops expressed their pain at finding that so many Catholics still saw nothing sinful in enrolment in Freemasonry. Some thought that the papal bulls did not apply everywhere. In this connexion the following quotation from a writer in the *Freemasons' Quarterly Journal* in 1846, signing himself "A Catholic", is of interest. "I became a mason in *La Charité* at Amsterdam in Holland in 1818," he says, "and for several years afterwards never heard of the decrees of the Popes until I went to Portugal and Spain, where I met with hundreds of ecclesiastics who were masons, and who understood those decrees to be merely local." The "hundreds" may well be an exaggeration, but the rest of the statement does not lack verisimilitude. Daniel O'Connell was also, it seems, ignorant that membership of Freemasonry was forbidden to Catholics.² Many English Catholics who were members of lodges only renounced Freemasonry when the papal condemnation of it was renewed by Pius IX in 1865, and even then there was much murmuring. "As a child," writes the late Miss Maude Petre, "I often heard Catholics say that the objections on which this prohibition was grounded, were quite unjustified by English Freemasonry."³ So rooted was this belief that Lord Ripon allowed himself to be re-elected as Grand Master in 1874, almost on the

¹ *Annales des Bretagne*, Vol. XXVII, pp. 447-448.

² J. G. Findel, *History of Freemasonry*, 2nd, ed., 1869, p. 410.

³ *The Ninth Lord Petre*, p. 30. This peer was himself a Grand Master.

eve of his reception into the Church, and his biographer, Mr. Lucien Wolf, says that this was due to his belief that the papal bulls on the subject were no longer in force, though perhaps it would have been more accurate to say that it was his belief that they did not touch Freemasonry, as it existed in this country. It is not surprising that Ripon was accused of being a crypto-Jesuit, of having been secretly received into the Church eighteen months before, and "of conspiring with the bitterest enemy of Freemasonry to strike a deadly blow at the Institution".¹ The fiercely anti-clerical masons of later times often spoke regretfully of those easy-going eighteenth-century ecclesiastics, who did not permit their tonsures to debar them from wearing the apron.

HUMPHREY J. T. JOHNSON

A SAINT OF THE MONTH

JANUARY 12TH—ST. AELRED, ABBOT OF RIEVAULX

AELRED, the "dulcedo monachorum", as a poet of his time called him, the St. Bernard of England, the Saxon troubadour of friendship in Jesus, well deserves to lead off this little cavalcade of saints, if only because he was himself so great a one for delving into holy lives and conserving their fragrance. How did the author of the *Wandering Scholars* come to omit Aelred's portrait from her fascinating gallery? If he never wandered much except once to Rome and Cîteaux, and a few times to Scotland, he loved his classics as dearly as any Italian Fortunatus or Irish Sedulius and Christianized Cicero in a little golden dialogue *De Spirituali Amicitia*, which begins: "Here we are, you and I, and I hope that Christ makes a third between us." Aelred had the ambiguous distinction of being the son and grandson of two eminent and combative priests named Eilaf, who did something to atone for the irregularity of their lives by restoring with much love and labour St. Wilfrid's priory in Hexham, after Danes and Normans had ravaged it. As Eilaf is a peculiarly Danish name perhaps our Saint had a few drops of the ravager's blood in his veins. Five out of Hexham's

¹ *Life of Lord Ripon*, i, p. 292.

twelve bishops had been canonized, and their bones were the glory of the little high-perched ancient Northumbrian town on the Halgut, the holy stream, which makes a humble contribution to the Tyne twenty miles west of Newcastle. There Aelred was born in the year 1110, when Henry I, the Beauclerc, and his Good Queen Maud ruled England, while Maud's brother Alexander, a man "amiable and humble enough with the monks and clergy but to the rest of his subjects a terror",¹ did the same for Scotland. Alexander's brother David, who succeeded him in 1124 and reigned for nineteen exciting years, is central in St. Aelred's story as being, in his own words, the man he "loved best in the whole world". David had much to do, not always peaceably, with Northumbria and often visited Hexham to worship at the shrines of the saints. He was quickly attracted by the little son of the parish priest, and took Aelred into his suite as page and companion for his own son Prince Henry. Another boy in that happy garden of youth also destined to be an abbot and to be canonized was the charming Waltheof, great-grandson of the giant Dane Siward, Earl of Northumbria, who fought the Normans and lamented at the end of his gory days that he had not been killed decently in one of his countless battles but left "to die in bed like a cow"². Aelred's schooling with those small inheritors of the earth was extremely casual, but it gave him immense satisfaction. "I used to thrill with the joy of their company", he said, "and my whole soul went out to them in affection and love, till I felt that there was nothing on earth sweeter or pleasanter or more of a gain than to love and be loved" (*P.L.*, 195, 659).

But if Aelred loved Henry, "tam dulcis, tam amabilis, tam affabilis", he absolutely worshipped Henry's father, and David as both prince and king returned him the compliment. He made the Anglian youth, while still only in his teens, his seneschal, high office described by Aelred as knighthood of the pots and pans, and would have put a jewelled mitre on his fair head if the same head had not conceived a grander dream. It was a case of David and Jonathan all over again, with the dignities reversed, and, indeed, Scotland's David bore a curious resemblance in sin and repentance to the David of Israel. One day he is unmistakably the son of St. Margaret, and the next as plainly the child of the fierce marauding

¹ So Aelred himself in his *Genealogia Regum Anglorum* which he wrote for the edification of Henry, Duke of Normandy, a little later Henry II of England. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 195, col. 756. To save footnotes, references to this primary source will be given in brackets in the text as *P.L.*, followed by the numbers of the volume and column.

² Waltheof's mother, Matilda, married as her second husband King David of Scotland, so the boy was that monarch's stepson.

Malcolm of the Big Head who is alleged to have transported Birnam Wood to Dunsinane. But Aelred's pen was as selective as a sun-dial and numbered only his friend's serene and shining hours. "With my own eyes I saw him," he writes, "take his foot from the stirrup and return to the palace with a poor suppliant who had run up at the last moment, there sweetly and patiently to listen to his story, all thought of hunting for that day forgotten. . . . He was just the same to everyone who appealed to him, priest or soldier, rich or poor, his own liegeman or a stranger, merchant or rustic, dealing with them so humbly and appropriately that each went away believing his own case to be the King's only concern" (*P.L.*, 195, 714).

David himself told Aelred a beautiful story about his sister Matilda, the Good Queen Maud of England and mother of the other Matilda who fought Stephen and was anything but a saint. "When as a lad," he said, "I was serving at the English Court, the Queen summoned me to her apartments one evening. And what do you think I found, but the whole room full of lepers and the Queen standing in the midst of them! At sight of me she put aside her mantle and taking a towel and basin began to wash and wipe the feet of those lepers, gathering each foot into her hands as she finished and kissing it with the greatest devotion. 'O, my Lady,' I cried to her, 'what are you doing? If the King knew this, never again would he kiss a mouth tainted by the feet of lepers.' She smiled and said: 'I like even better the lips of the Eternal King. Come, dearest brother, I brought you here so that you might learn this service. Take a basin now and do exactly as you see me doing.' At that I trembled with horror and told her it was utterly beyond me. You see, I did not yet know the Lord nor was his spirit revealed to me. When she persisted, alas I just took to my heels and rejoined my companions" (*P.L.*, 195, 736).

When Aelred was twenty-three, King David sent him on a mission to the great and holy Archbishop Thurstan of York, the indomitable old Becket of the North who five years later roused the county parish by parish to meet and overthrow the same peerless David, on foray bent, at the Battle of the Standard. Aelred himself, as we shall see, was to be the Homer of that famous fight in which the saints took so prominent a part. Both men guessed that they would not meet again, and many years later, after David's death, Aelred was still affected by the memory of their good-bye: "O my sweet lord and friend, I shall never forget the kiss you gave me that day we parted and the tears you shed. You are enshrined in my heart of hearts, to be remembered lovingly each morning, when the Son is immolated to the Father for all men's salvation." Even more touching was his cry from the

cloister when he heard that David was dead: "O sweet soul, where hast thou gone away and stolen from sight? Our eyes seek thee and find thee not. Our ears strain to catch thy pleasant humble voice, the voice of thy confession and consolation, *et ecce! silentium*. Where is that sweet face which showed itself so gentle to the poor, so humble to the servants of God, and so merry and loving to thy own servants. And where are those eyes full of tenderness and graciousness whose smile made happy men happier and whose tears were mingled with the tears of those who wept? As for me, I shall never cease to weep, remembering my sweet lord and friend."¹

The year before Aelred's visit to York, a great thing had happened in the county. A band of Cistercians, thirteen strong, sent by St. Bernard himself under the leadership of his friend and scribe William, an Englishman,² came to found the first English daughter-house of Clairvaux on land given them by Walter Espec, lord of Helmsley, in the lovely secluded Rye Vale, from which their monastery took its famous name of Rievaulx. There was not much of Rievaulx' future grandeur to be seen when Aelred wandered there in 1133, perhaps a few mean huts and thirteen white-robed men digging and hewing as if their lives depended on it, which they did.³ But he had not come seeking any beauty except the beauty of holiness, "which consists in a tender and eager affection towards our Lord and Saviour", and before his first day at Rievaulx was over he knew that here, with those silent, smiling, friendly navvies of God, lay the clue to his long-frustrated quest. Of course, he would have us believe that he was the prodigal son coming home, with the stench of the pigsty still in his rags, but all the saints conspire to tell that story because they have glimpsed the perfections of God. No Christian ever born had a more tender and eager affection for our Lord and Saviour than Bernard of Clairvaux, but in the judgement of the Cistercians themselves his English son, Aelred of Rievaulx, ran

¹ Cited from a Latin Cottonian manuscript by Raine, *The Priory of Hexham*, Surtees Society, vol. i (1864), p. 16. In the Chronicle of Prior John of Hexham published in this volume there is an excellent account of Archbishop Thurstan's activities, austerities and charities. But the learned and genial Canon Raine was rather shocked by the great prelate's last act on earth. He joined the Cluniac community at Pontefract shortly before his end and as he lay dying caused the monks to chant the Office for the Dead in his cell, himself taking the whole nine *Lectiones*! (L.C., pp. 128-31).

² Canonized locally if not in Rome, for his shrine has been discovered and on it may plainly be read the words, SCS WILLMUS Abbas (Peers, in *The Archaeological Journal*, vol. 86, 1929, pp. 20-8).

³ They began in the direst poverty, with land and little else, and could not start to build their church until ten years later. The ground was so awkward that they had to hew terraces out of the hillside and erect their "house exceeding magnifical unto the Lord" facing north and south instead of east and west (*The Chartulary of Rievaulx*, Surtees Society, 1887, pp. lix-lxiv).

him very close. *Bernardo prope par, Aelredus noster*—such was the Order's verdict ages ago and such it remains.¹

The dates of his quiet history are soon given. The Battle of the Standard, fought in 1138 almost at the monks' back door, must have caused as much excitement to Aelred and his brethren as is compatible with the Rule of St. Benedict, strictly interpreted. Two years later, he was sent to Rome by Abbot William on the Order's business. Then, in 1141, we find him master of novices at Rievaulx, and the following year he is appointed by William abbot of the new monastery at Revesby in Lincolnshire, Rievaulx' third offspring in a bare ten years.² Abbot William died in 1145 and was succeeded by Maurice, another monk of Clairvaux, who could not manage the swarming and often difficult community. Within a few months he recalled Aelred and thankfully resigned the heavy charge of abbot into his capable young hands. Abbot our Saint remained until his death twenty years later.

From the *Vita Aelredi* of his disciple Walter Daniel,³ we gain some idea of the extraordinary influence wielded by this one man, for we hear of no less than seventeen abbeys and monasteries in England and Scotland which bloomed before God under his gardening. Like St. Bernard, who seemed in the eyes of contemporaries to have come to Yorkshire in Aelred's sandals, he possessed a very genius for friendship, and like Bernard, too, nearly all his books were written to order, the order of his friends. Thus, his first and largest work, the *Mirror of Charity*, which occupies 115 columns of Migne, was written at the genial provocation of his friend Gervase, Abbot of Louth Park in Lincolnshire, a *filiale* of Fountains. Gervase addresses him in the following strain: "I asked your Fraternity, I even ordered you, nay, I adjured you in

¹ Abbot le Bail of Notre Dame de Scourmont, Chimay, Belgium, in Viller's *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, t. i (1937), coll. 225-34. The late Watkin Williams, St. Bernard's great Anglican lover and biographer, lamented that his hero was so little known as to be associated in the public mind almost exclusively with a breed of life-saving dogs. Aelred has not even the hair of a dog, never mind the fact that the canine St. Bernards were not named after the Abbot of Clairvaux, to keep him in popular remembrance. Rievaulx is now a national monument, but Aelred, who largely created it, is forgotten.

² The two predecessors were Wardon, Bedfordshire, and the second Melrose, about thirty-seven miles south of Edinburgh, which had King David for its founder and his stepson St. Waltheof for its first abbot. According to the chronicler, Jocelyn of Furness, Waltheof consulted only two advisers when deciding about his Cistercian vocation, his Angel Guardian and his friend from childhood, Aelred. The same Jocelyn, who knew Aelred, has a little rhyme about him in his charming life of Waltheof. He says that he was *Facetus, facundus, Socialis et jucundus, Liberalis et discretus*—a splendid string of adjectives for any abbot's or superior's crown (*Acta Sanctorum*, Augusti vol. i, p. 257).

³ Published in part with a fine commentary by Professor Powicke, Manchester, 1922.

the name of God to write me a few pages . . . And what happens? You wail that your shoulders are too weak for such a yoke. Now, granted that my demand is burdensome, is difficult, is impossible, I do not grant that that is any excuse. I persist in my opinion. I repeat my orders. . . . You tell me that you are almost illiterate, and came, not from the schools, but from the kitchen, into the desert, where amid rocks and mountains you live like a rustic, sweating with axe and hammer for your daily bread . . . I am delighted to hear it, because I do not desire to read what you learned in any school except the school of the Holy Spirit . . . And as for that hammer you mentioned, I think it might be well employed hewing from the rock of your native sagacity such good things as must often occur to you while you rest under the shade of the trees in the heat of noon." Gervase concludes his semi-serious effusion as follows: "To spare your blushes, let this letter of ours be prefixed to your work, so that whatever may displease a reader in the *Speculum Charitatis*, for such is the title we impose upon it, may be attributed, not to you who brought it forth, but to us who made you. *Vale in Christo, dilecte frater*" (*P.L.*, 195, 501-4).

The influence of St. Augustine is strong in the *Speculum* and leads Aelred, with many a groan, to espouse that Saint's theory on the damnation of unbaptized infants, now held by no Catholic theologian. Apart from that blot, the book is a beautiful and satisfying treatise on Christian perfection, full, as are all Aelred's works, of tender and eager affection towards our Lord and Saviour, and characterized by his own special doctrine of the Sabbath of the Soul, by which he means the repose in God of mystical contemplation. Like St. Bernard and St. Augustine, his two great inspirers, he had the habit of soliloquy and expresses himself often in the most moving first-person prayers. Other friends, the monks Ivo, Walter and Gratian, who are his interlocutors in the dialogue, prevailed upon him to write the perfectly charming little work, *De Spirituali Amicitia*, which by itself is sufficient explanation why he was so widely and deeply loved.¹ Ivo is delightful. "You won't easily persuade me of that," he says when Aelred argues that friendship rightly understood is nothing else than wisdom, "cum in amicitia et aeternitas vigeat, et veritas luceat, et charitas dulcescat." Ivo: "Oh, what next? Would you have me say of friendship what the friend of Jesus, John, says of charity?" Aelred: "I admit that it is not usual nor

¹ This work has been translated into English (with introduction and notes) by Fr. Hugh Talbot, O.Cist., under the title *Christian Friendship* (The Catholic Book Club, Foyles).

warranted by the Scriptures, but still I do not hesitate to voice my own opinion, *Qui manet in AMICITIA in Deo manet, et Deus in eo.*" Then the supper-bell rings down the curtain on the first part, and afterwards Walter and Gratian take up the hunt in the remaining two (*P.L.*, 195, 661-702).

From first to last, the mysteries of the life of Jesus are the favourite themes of Aelred's voice and pen. His sermons deal almost exclusively with them, and he devotes to them the whole of his little burning *Tractatus de Jesu Duodenni* and a large part of his *De Vita eremitica*, written for his sister who became an anchoress, like Julian of Norwich. The *Tractatus*, full of Bernardine echoes, is one of the sweetest flowers of the Middle Ages. He pictures the soul, his own loving soul, lost in the delights of contemplation, to whom comes charity in the guise of our Lady with a reproach on her lips, *Fili, quid fecisti nobis sic?* "Suddenly, at that dear voice, we remember in the midst of our Jerusalem that such a one is ill and sad and looking for our paternal consolation, that another is labouring under temptation and needs our support, . . . that a third is the victim of *acedia* and runs hither and thither, seeking someone to consult and to encourage him . . ." (*P.L.*, 184, 849-79.) That exquisite little piece also was composed to please a friend. The work written for his hermit sister is so full of Anselmian unction that to this day one finds no less than eighteen chapters of it included in the *Meditationes* attributed to the great Benedictine Doctor of the Church, who died Archbishop of Canterbury the year before Aelred was born. But they are Aelred's unquestionably,¹ and one has to implore his help to resist the insidious temptation to quote from this most touching anthology of the love of Jesus. He tells us what sort of a recluse he was himself in his counsels to his sister: "Open your heart in one wide gesture of love to embrace the whole world, thinking of all the good people in it that you may congratulate them, and of all the bad that you may weep for them. You will call to mind the misery of the poor, the moans of the orphans, the loneliness of the widows, the desolation of those who grieve, the necessities of pilgrims, the perils of men on the sea, the vows of virgins, the temptations of monks, the anxieties of bishops, the hardships of soldiers. To all of these you will fling wide the portals of your heart, to them you will consecrate your tears, for them you will pour out your prayers" (*P.L.*, 32, 1465).

But best of all as a revelation of this dear Saint's spirit is the *Oratio Pastoralis* which he wrote to keep his own abbatial self in

¹ As Dom André Wilmart has learnedly proved in the *Revue Bénédictine*, 1924, pp. 60-1.

mind of his duty.¹ He begins with an appeal to the Good Shepherd: "O bone pastor Jhesu, pastor bone, pastor clemens, pastor pie, ad te clamat miser et miserabilis quidam pastor, . . . anxius pro se, anxius pro ovibus tuis." This is followed by an act of contrition for all his sins, and of gratitude that they are not many more, because, as he says, echoing St. Augustine, "non minus debitor tibi sum etiam et pro illis malis quaecumque non feci". Next, he examines his conscience of an abbot and is appalled at what he finds: "Such is the one, sweet Lord, whom Thou hast placed over Thy family, bidding him be careful for them who has so little care for himself. . . . O wretched man, what have I done and presumed and consented to? . . . Why, O fountain of mercy, didst Thou commit these Thy so dear ones to the care of such a one as I? . . . See my wounds, Lord . . . Look on me, look on me, *dulcis Domine*, for I hope that in Thy pity Thou wilt look as a kind physician to heal, or a solicitous master to correct or an indulgent father to pardon." Then he prays for his huge family of choir monks and lay brothers, said to have numbered more than six hundred: "Thou knowest my heart, Lord, and that whatsoever Thou hast given to me Thy servant I desire to lay out wholly on them and to consume it all in their service . . . My senses and my speech, my leisure and my labour, my acts and my thoughts, my good fortune and bad, my health and sickness, my life and death, all my stock in the world, may it be used up in their interest for whom Thou didst not disdain Thyself to be consumed . . . Grant to me, Lord, by Thy ineffable grace to bear their infirmities with patient, tender, helpful compassion. May I learn by the teaching of Thy Spirit to console the sorrowful, to strengthen the faint-hearted, to put the fallen on their feet, to quieten the restless, to cherish the sick, conforming myself to each one's character and capacity . . . And since through the weakness of my flesh, or the cowardice and evil of my heart, my labours, vigils and frugality do little, nay nothing, to edify them, I beg Thee to grant that my humility, my charity, my patience and my pity may supply in their place. May my words and teaching edify them, and may my prayers be always their support . . . Thou knowest, sweet Lord, how much I love them and how my heart goes out to them in tenderest affection . . . that I yearn rather to help them in charity than to rule them, that I

¹ It was published for the first time by Dom André Wilmart in the *Revue Bénédictine*, 1925, pp. 267-271, from a manuscript in the library of Jesus College, Cambridge. Perhaps a Jesuit may be forgiven for feeling a little pleasure that it was one of his own tribe, Father Richard Gibbons, who first saw Aelred's works in general into print: *Divi Aelredi Rhievallensis Opera Omnia ope et studio R. Gibboni, S.J., ex vetustis MSS. nunc primum in lucem producta*. Douay 1616, 1631. This was several years before the first Cistercian edition.

would humbly be under their feet if only affectionately in their hearts. Grant unto me, then, O Lord my God, that Thy eyes may be opened upon them day and night. Tenderly expand Thy wings to protect them. Extend Thy holy right hand to bless them. Pour into their hearts Thy Holy Spirit who may stand by them while they pray to refresh them with devout compunction, to stimulate them with hope, to make them humble with fear, and to inflame them with charity . . . May He, the kind Consoler, succour them in temptation and help their weakness in all the troubles and tribulations of this life. . . ."

Though it does not appear so clearly in those few passages, there are no less than 59 Scriptural quotations or allusions in the 186 Latin lines of the *Oratio*, for Aelred's thoughts were completely dyed in the language of revelation. Indeed, it would seem that he must have known his Bible by heart. Among what may be called his historical works are devoutly written lives of St. Edward the Confessor, occupying fifty columns in Migne, of St. Ninian and of St. Margaret of Scotland. It was at his instance and with his aid that Prior Reginald drew up his account of the miracles of St. Cuthbert, and when the Austin canons of Hexham wanted the Legend of their own saints committed to parchment, to Aelred they turned. He must have found the writing of *De miraculis Hagulstaldensis Ecclesiae* a labour of love,¹ for he reckoned the feast day of the Hexham saints as his own birthday—*Haec est nativitas mea*. . . . Easily the most interesting and vivid of his secular writings is his account of the Battle of the Standard, from which modern historians have drawn with both hands and scanty acknowledgement. It cannot have been an easy story for him to tell because half of his heart was in each of the rival camps, one half with King David, the beloved aggressor, and the other with the English captain, Walter Espec, that "great giant of a man with a huge black beard and a voice like a trumpet", who had founded Rievaulx and retired to die there as a monk in Aelred's arms. What he does in effect is to blame the horrible Picts for David's defeat, while at the same time glorying in the victory of Walter. In Homeric fashion, he puts a thundering denunciation of the Picts on Walter's lips, and having thus satisfied his patriotism turns to praise the vanquished friends of his youth, David and Henry (*P.L.*, 195, 701-12). He had taught

¹ A cynic might say, too much love and too little labour, but Aelred, though very credulous, nearly always gives the stories of miracles a practical twist which is both disarming and refreshing. He obviously enjoyed telling the story of the youth who was condemned to death for theft and saved at the very last moment by St. Wilfrid. As the executioner swung his axe this hero cried out, "Adjuva nunc, Wilfride, quia si modo nolueris paulo post non poteris", a sally which rendered the headsman helpless with laughter and gave time for two men, "equis velocissimis vecti", to arrive and effect a rescue (Raine, *The Priory of Hexham*, i, 173-203).

that friendship, true friendship in Christ, is unalterable, and if David had burned Rievaulx over his head he would still have loved him.

In times like our own it is heartening to remember that the stormy and passionate period of Aelred's existence was one of the greatest ages of Catholic revival, when 115 monasteries sprang from the soul in the space of nineteen years to transform both the physical and spiritual face of England. Of all that marvellous renaissance the Abbot of Rievaulx, ever, like the Church herself, ailing in the body, was the soul and inspiration. "During the four years before he died," wrote a chronicler of the time, "he became so emaciated from fasting that he was only skin and bone." We are given a glimpse of him crouched on the floor with his head between his knees, rocking to and fro in the agony of the stone. "A racking cough and other infirmities so weakened him that often after saying Mass he would stumble back to his cell and lie collapsed on his pallet, unable to speak or move for an hour" (*P.L.*, 195, 202-4). And yet he was the choir-master of the "singing masons building roofs of gold", who loved best in all the dictionary the two words *dulcis* and *jucundus*. Men called him, as they did St. Bernard, the honey-tongued and the honey-souled who, like the bees, distilled an elixir *dulcedine dulcius ipsa*. They said that nobody could read him once without wanting to read him again, which is absolutely true, as anybody can find by trying (*P.L.*, 195, 207-8; and particularly, 184, 216-8). Aelred died on 12 January, 1166, in his fifty-seventh year, a poor age for a Cistercian.

J. BRODRICK, S.J.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

HOLY SCRIPTURE

EARLY in the second volume of Canon Ernest Dimnet's enchanting memoirs there are two sentences which appear especially worthy of underlining. The author writes: "I have always felt inclined to think that the reputation of intellectual people for lack of practicality is a figment of people far on the wrong side of intellectuality, who look for comfort in what certainly is an invidious fallacy. Voltaire and Victor Hugo must have left their bankers dazzled and wondering more than once."¹ Doubtless the Canon, himself a man of ideas, is deeply preju-

¹ *My New World*: London, Cape, 1938, p. 16.

diced in their favour. Elsewhere in his life-history he declares that the members of his own nation, the French, "love literature, live on it, and, I am afraid, will die of it, but that is another story". None the less, the sentences quoted are not merely a scholar's *obiter dicta*; they can be proved in their more important aspect by many examples in addition to those given by Canon Dimnet, that is, by the mention of names which should certainly include that of the late Cardinal Joseph MacRory, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of All Ireland. At the outbreak of the recent war he was one of not less than five members of the Sacred College (Cardinals Hinsley, Innitzer, Faulhaber, and Tisserant being the other four) who had at some time or other been professors of Holy Scripture or Eastern languages. In his own case, his long priestly life of a diamond jubilarian was neatly divided into two periods of thirty years apiece. Throughout the first period he was a lecturer and a writer, as the first president of Dungannon Academy, as professor at Olton Seminary, and then (from 1889 till 1915) as a member of the Maynooth theological faculty. During the second period he was a diocesan bishop, much occupied with practical affairs but never forgetting his lifework as a professor, which he loved to discuss when some brother-scripturist was of the party.

Cardinal MacRory's published work, while never extensive and now somewhat less useful than it once was, since it is no longer up to date, has done good service in its time and can still be consulted with advantage. His *Gospel of St. John* (3rd ed., 1908) and his larger volume *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians with introductions and commentary* (3rd ed., 1935) are handy and well-printed editions of the Vulgate and Douay New Testament versions of these books with commentaries sufficient for ordinary needs. It would not be claimed that they have made any great contribution to our knowledge of the books concerned, but the matter is well set out, is lucidly expressed, and must have saved many students a vast amount of note-taking in long-hand. In his preface to the latest edition of the latter work, the Cardinal wrote that: "The work remains substantially the same as in the previous editions: no changes of importance, and extremely few of any kind, have been made." Since the new issue involved a re-setting of the type it may be regretted that no attempt was made to bring the book up to date. A few recent books (e.g. the commentaries by Allo and Callan) were mentioned in the bibliography.

The late Cardinal was a founder and one of the five original co-editors of the *Irish Theological Quarterly*. Some account of this periodical's foundation is given in the late Dr. Walter McDonald's *Reminiscences of a Maynooth Professor*.¹ Of the many articles contributed by Dr. MacRory three were reprinted in 1934 under the title: *The New Testament and Divorce*. Once, at least, in recent years the Cardinal was able to make

¹ London, Cape, 1925; chapter 21: *The Irish Theological Quarterly*.

that friendship, true friendship in Christ, is unalterable, and if David had burned Rievaulx over his head he would still have loved him.

In times like our own it is heartening to remember that the stormy and passionate period of Aelred's existence was one of the greatest ages of Catholic revival, when 115 monasteries sprang from the soul in the space of nineteen years to transform both the physical and spiritual face of England. Of all that marvellous renaissance the Abbot of Rievaulx, ever, like the Church herself, ailing in the body, was the soul and inspiration. "During the four years before he died," wrote a chronicler of the time, "he became so emaciated from fasting that he was only skin and bone." We are given a glimpse of him crouched on the floor with his head between his knees, rocking to and fro in the agony of the stone. "A racking cough and other infirmities so weakened him that often after saying Mass he would stumble back to his cell and lie collapsed on his pallet, unable to speak or move for an hour" (*P.L.*, 195, 202-4). And yet he was the choir-master of the "singing masons building roofs of gold", who loved best in all the dictionary the two words *dulcis* and *jucundus*. Men called him, as they did St. Bernard, the honey-tongued and the honey-souled who, like the bees, distilled an elixir *dulcedine dulcius ipsa*. They said that nobody could read him once without wanting to read him again, which is absolutely true, as anybody can find by trying (*P.L.*, 195, 207-8; and particularly, 184, 216-8). Aelred died on 12 January, 1166, in his fifty-seventh year, a poor age for a Cistercian.

J. BRODRICK, S.J.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

HOLY SCRIPTURE

EARLY in the second volume of Canon Ernest Dimnet's enchanting memoirs there are two sentences which appear especially worthy of underlining. The author writes: "I have always felt inclined to think that the reputation of intellectual people for lack of practicality is a figment of people far on the wrong side of intellectuality, who look for comfort in what certainly is an invidious fallacy. Voltaire and Victor Hugo must have left their bankers dazzled and wondering more than once."¹ Doubtless the Canon, himself a man of ideas, is deeply preju-

¹ *My New World*: London, Cape, 1938, p. 16.

diced in their favour. Elsewhere in his life-history he declares that the members of his own nation, the French, "love literature, live on it, and, I am afraid, will die of it, but that is another story". None the less, the sentences quoted are not merely a scholar's *obiter dicta*; they can be proved in their more important aspect by many examples in addition to those given by Canon Dimnet, that is, by the mention of names which should certainly include that of the late Cardinal Joseph MacRory, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of All Ireland. At the outbreak of the recent war he was one of not less than five members of the Sacred College (Cardinals Hinsley, Innitzer, Faulhaber, and Tisserant being the other four) who had at some time or other been professors of Holy Scripture or Eastern languages. In his own case, his long priestly life of a diamond jubilarian was neatly divided into two periods of thirty years apiece. Throughout the first period he was a lecturer and a writer, as the first president of Dungannon Academy, as professor at Olton Seminary, and then (from 1889 till 1915) as a member of the Maynooth theological faculty. During the second period he was a diocesan bishop, much occupied with practical affairs but never forgetting his lifework as a professor, which he loved to discuss when some brother-scripturist was of the party.

Cardinal MacRory's published work, while never extensive and now somewhat less useful than it once was, since it is no longer up to date, has done good service in its time and can still be consulted with advantage. His *Gospel of St. John* (3rd ed., 1908) and his larger volume *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians with introductions and commentary* (3rd ed., 1935) are handy and well-printed editions of the Vulgate and Douay New Testament versions of these books with commentaries sufficient for ordinary needs. It would not be claimed that they have made any great contribution to our knowledge of the books concerned, but the matter is well set out, is lucidly expressed, and must have saved many students a vast amount of note-taking in long-hand. In his preface to the latest edition of the latter work, the Cardinal wrote that: "The work remains substantially the same as in the previous editions: no changes of importance, and extremely few of any kind, have been made." Since the new issue involved a re-setting of the type it may be regretted that no attempt was made to bring the book up to date. A few recent books (e.g. the commentaries by Allo and Callan) were mentioned in the bibliography.

The late Cardinal was a founder and one of the five original co-editors of the *Irish Theological Quarterly*. Some account of this periodical's foundation is given in the late Dr. Walter McDonald's *Reminiscences of a Maynooth Professor*.¹ Of the many articles contributed by Dr. MacRory three were reprinted in 1934 under the title: *The New Testament and Divorce*. Once, at least, in recent years the Cardinal was able to make

¹ London, Cape, 1925; chapter 21: *The Irish Theological Quarterly*.

very effective use of his special knowledge. This was on the occasion of an attack directed against the Petrine claims by Dr. Gregg, then Protestant Primate in Dublin, and now in Armagh. The Cardinal decided to take up the challenge in person, and contributed a long, admirably clear, and (as it seemed to the present writer on hearing the Cardinal's reading of it from his manuscript) quite unanswerable reply, which occupied an entire page of the Irish daily in which it appeared. Personally, as all who met him can bear witness, His Eminence was kind, most easy of approach, and full of good humour and fun. *Lux perpetua luceat ei.*

In his preface to *The Psalter in the Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures*¹ Fr. Lattey tells us that the demand for an *editio minor* of the Westminster Psalter was quite designedly not met until some part of the larger work had appeared in the shape of *The First Book of Psalms*, published in 1939. He wished to be able to "refer to the fuller introduction which accompanies it for much that cannot be explained or justified here". Naturally enough in a one-volume edition of this size, there "are many points upon which more detailed explanations may be desired, which (it is hoped) will be found later on in the larger edition". Meanwhile, we have here a short introduction which discusses concisely the question of authorship, the text of the Psalter and the titles of the Psalms; a complete translation based upon the best existing texts; and a necessarily restricted selection from the notes which will eventually grace the *editio major*. It is to be noted that no use could be made in the present work of the recently issued new translation by the professors of the Biblical Institute in Rome, but this is by no means a misfortune, since we are thus privileged to have two quite fresh and independent translations, made in each case by a scholar or scholars of distinction, which may profitably be compared by all who take an interest in the numerous *cruces interpretum* of the Psalter.

Here are a few examples of readings in which the two versions differ. In 2: 12, Fr. Lattey accepts as "the most likely rendering of a difficult text" the reading *nasseku beraglaw*: "Kiss his feet", thus following Lagrange, Dhorme, Calès, and a number of other writers. The Institute's version has: *Praestate obsequium ei* (cp. the Vulgate's *Apprehendite disciplinam*) in its text, but in a footnote refers to the other reading as "forte legendum". The only serious objection (and one that can easily be exaggerated) is that to kiss the feet of Yahveh is, as Père Calès writes, "un anthropomorphisme jusqu'ici inconnu". Calès himself accepts the reading in default of anything better, and in his Latin translation has: "Osculamini pedes ejus."² In 34: 11, Fr. Lattey seems to be justified in reading: "The faithless suffer want and hunger"

¹ By Father Cuthbert Lattey, S.J., London, Sands, 1945. Pp. xvi+281. Price 10s. 6d. net.

² *Le Livre des Psaumes, traduit et commenté*: Paris, Beauchesne, 1936, I, p. 102.

where the new Latin version continues to read "Divites" with the Greek. P. Zorell, S.J., in a note on this verse in his *Psalterium exHebraeo Latinum* (Rome, 1928) remarks that the rendering *infideles apostatae* suited the context well, but lacked sufficient evidence in Old Testament usage. More recently, as Fr. Lattey notes, Professor G. R. Driver provided the evidence by way of a more thorough analysis of the meaning of the root *kpr*.¹ Professor Driver's help is likewise acknowledged in the note to 42: 11, where "Like a murderer hacking my bones, mine adversaries taunt me" is surely preferable to the Institute's: "Ossa mea franguntur, dum insultant mihi adversarii mei."

These are examples in which the Westminster Version seems to give the better reading. On the other hand, in the case of *Dixit Dominus* (110, Vulg. 109) many readers will prefer the text as reconstructed by the Institute's translators to Father Lattey's, notably in verse 3, which the Westminster Version renders:

Thy people are willing in the day of thy muster:
From the womb of the dawn upon the holy mountains,
Thy youth appear as the dew.

This is, of course, an entirely scholarly and legitimate version keeping close to the Massoretic text with some help from the well-known rendering: *In montibus sacris*, contributed by St. Jerome's translation from the Hebrew. A very similar rendering which, however, prefers *in ornatu sacro* to St. Jerome's correction, is found in P. Zorell's excellent Latin work; this emphasizes the fact that the verse was never used by any New Testament writer in proof of Christ's Divinity, doubtless because it had less probative force in the Hebrew than in the Septuagint rendering to which we are accustomed. It might, however, have been possible, even in an *editio minor*, to give as a footnote either the Septuagint and Vulgate reading or some other one that is a trifle nearer than the Massoretic text to the rendering so long traditional in the Church's liturgy. For example, Père Calès in his Latin version reads:

Tecum principatus in die nativitatis tuae,
In splendoribus sanctitatis.
Ante luciferum tanquam rorem genui te.

This is substantially, also, the rendering of the new Latin version whose editors make it abundantly clear that in this context they prefer the Septuagint and Syriac Peshitto versions to the Massoretic text. There are a few misprints in this generally well-printed edition, e.g. McFayden p. x; Psalm CVIX, at the top of p. 215; and 1 May, 1019, on p. 218.

Some years ago, the Anglican canon who is better known as

¹ *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. 36, pp. 33-38.

"George A. Birmingham" published a book made up entirely of questions on Holy Scripture with the title: *Do You Know Your Bible?*¹ Some of the questions were childishly simple; others might well be set as a holiday task (no books allowed) to many experienced students of Scripture. The people who would score heavily would be those who could remember at short notice the number and distributions of the cities of refuge or could answer the type of context-question which demands: "Who killed what in a pit 'in the time of snow'?" And it must be admitted that there have been and are a quantity of textbooks (more especially among non-Catholics) which seem chiefly designed to prepare students for this species of examination. Recently, however, there has been a consistent demand for a textbook which, while not ignoring necessary detail, will somehow manage to bring out the main lines of the Bible's religious teaching, and in particular the religious teaching of the Old Testament, so often neglected in the past. An excellent example of this newer type of book is the *Histoire Religieuse de l'Ancien Testament: Cours Supérieur d'Histoire Sainte*, produced in collaboration by the Soeurs des Ecoles Chrétiennes of Vorselaar and Canon Joseph Coppens, the well-known professor of Old Testament exegesis in the University of Louvain.²

It was in 1933 that the Sisters of Vorselaar published a small Flemish manual entitled *The Messianic Idea throughout the Old Testament*, which had quite unexpected success, was reprinted in 1936, and translated into French in the following year. In the interval Canon Coppens had given his now celebrated conference on the teaching of the Old Testament at the "Congrès de l'Enseignement catholique" held in Luxembourg. The present manual has been planned according to the programme laid down in the conference, and the whole of its teaching centres round the two great beliefs proclaimed in the Old Testament—the belief in one God, and the belief in the coming of the Messias. So the four parts of the work are entitled respectively: the setting of the Old Testament revelation; the moral and religious decadence of humanity; the moral and religious ascent of the human race through the promise and expectation of a Messias; and, finally, the ascent of humanity through faith in one God. The subject-matter is excellently worked out, and a number of maps and plans make some amends for the absence of Canon Creten's photographs, which must await a more plentiful and less costly supply of the glossy-surfaced paper needed for their reproduction.

JOHN M. T. BARTON.

¹ London, Gollancz, 1928.

² Brussels, Desclée de Brouwer, 1945. Pp. 186. Price 50 francs.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

STATUES OF OUR LADY AND ST. JOSEPH

If the Divine Child is represented in these statues, is there any law as to the position Our Lord should have? I have heard it maintained that is wrong to represent the Divine Infant in the arms of St. Joseph. (H.)

REPLY

Canon 1279, §1: *Nemini liceat in ecclesiis, etiam exemptis, aliisve locis sacris ullam insolitam ponere vel ponendam curare imaginem, nisi ab Ordinario loci sit approbata.*

§2. *Ordinarius autem sacras imagines publice ad fidelium venerationem exponendas ne approbet, quae cum probato Ecclesiae usu non congruant.*

§3. *Nunquam sinat Ordinarius in ecclesiis aliisve locis sacris exhiberi falsi dogmatis imagines vel quae debitam decentiam et honestatem non praeseferant, aut rudibus periculosi erroris occasionem praebeant.*

i. A distinction must be made between "insolita", in §1 of this canon, and "quae cum probato Ecclesiae usu non congruant" in §2; otherwise, if they mean exactly the same thing, the second section denies to the Ordinary the powers granted to him in the first section, which is unreasonable. It must be held with Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome*, II, §605, that a statue, though of a new design or symbolism, and therefore unusual, may nevertheless be in harmony with ecclesiastical usage. If a statue is unusual in form or symbolism, the Ordinary's permission is required for its public erection and veneration, and the permission will not be given unless the novelty conforms in other respects, with ecclesiastical usage. Thus the statue of Our Lady of Lourdes has certain features which, though unusual at one time, are not in conflict with any ecclesiastical usage. If the novelty offered for the Ordinary's approbation suggests false doctrine, or may be the occasion of error to the uninstructed, there is scarcely any problem to discuss. Whether it offends or not against propriety (*decentia*, *honestas*) is largely a matter of opinion, and an artist's outlook may be startlingly different from that of the ordinary person: the decision is for the Ordinary, if the statue is to be placed in a church or sacred place, and the aggrieved parties may have recourse to the Holy See.

ii. In accordance with the above principles, certain representations have been forbidden by the Holy See, though one is free to argue for what precise reason. Thus, *S.R.C.*, 23 February, 1894, n. 3818, decided

"non expedit" in the case of a statue of Our Lady of Sorrows vested in black with a crucifix in the left hand. The prohibition of the Holy Office, 8 April, 1916, *Fontes*, n. 1300, "imaginem B.M. Virginis vestibus sacerdotalibus indutae esse reprobendam", seems to be based on doctrinal reasons. A statue of St. Joseph portraying his heart would certainly be forbidden, since *S.R.C.*, 14 June, 1873, n. 3304, following earlier directions of the Holy See, decided that devotion to the heart of St. Joseph was not approved.

iii. When devotion to St. Joseph began to spread, the usual form of statue represented him holding a branch of olive or a lily, and occasionally leading the Infant Jesus by the hand. By the nineteenth century artists began to represent Our Lord in his arms, and we can find no official prohibition or discouragement of any kind against this form of statue, whether in pontifical or local decrees, though the innovation was strongly criticized in many quarters.¹ Some writers mention a letter from the *Holy Office*, 28 February, 1875, addressed to the Bishop of Przemyśl, directing that representations of Our Lady with the Divine Infant should show Him in her arms. We have not found this in any official collection. Students of iconography have argued that this is the correct position in the case of Our Lady, but not in the case of St. Joseph, since the Blessed Virgin is the real Mother of Christ whereas St. Joseph is not His real father. We think that if there were any remote danger of the uninstructed faithful being led to believe that a statue of St. Joseph with Our Lord in his arms implied that he was the real father, this form of statue would have been forbidden long ago. It has not been forbidden, to the best of our knowledge, and though the more traditional style is to represent St. Joseph either alone, or with the Divine child at his feet, the statue of the Saint with Our Lord in his arms is now so common that it can no longer be regarded as "insolita" in the terms of canon 1279, §1.

ORDO ADMINISTRANDI

Is it known who was responsible for the original issue of this Ritual for use in this country? (X.)

REPLY

The only reference of which we are aware is in Burton, *Life and Times of Bishop Challoner*, II, p. 339, which, on the authority of Bishop Milner, attributes the editorship of the book, issued in 1759 *Auctoritate Vicariorum Apostolicorum*, to Bishop Challoner. The title page is:

¹ Cf. *l'Ami du Clergé*, 1928, p. 734.

"Ordo / Administrandi Sacramenta / et alia / Quaedam officia Ecclesiastica rite peragendi / in Missione Anglicana. / Ex Rituali Romano / Jussu Pauli Quinti edito / Extractus / Nonnullis Adiectis / Ex antiquo Rituali Anglicano". The place of publication is not given; the title and format is similar to that found in all the subsequent editions up to and excluding the last one issued by Burns & Oates in 1915.

The smaller book previously in use is entitled: "Ordo / Baptizandi / aliaque / Sacramenta / Administrandi / et / Officia quaedam Ecclesiastica / Rite peragendi / Ex Rituali Romano jussu Pauli Quinti / edito, extractus. / Pro Anglia, Hibernia, / Et Scotia / Permissu Superiorum / Paris, / Anno Domini MDCCXXXVIII." It contains as an English Appendix the *Recommendation of a Soul departing* and *A Profession of Catholick Faith*.

One notable difference between the two books is in the rite of Baptism: the earlier one, as noted in this REVIEW, 1944, XXIV, p. 134, gave an English version of all the prayers throughout, immediately after the Latin formula; Challoner's revision, however, gives an English version only of those parts which are translated in our current book. It would appear, therefore, that either on Challoner's own authority or on that of the Vicars Apostolic collectively, this important modification occurred first in 1759.

The chief difference is markedly Challonerian in character. We are given a lengthy Appendix, with fresh pagination and a separate title page, containing various instructions and exhortations: "An / Appendix / to the / Ritual / containing / Instructions / and / Exhortations / proper to be made / by Priests in the Administration / of the / Sacraments / and other / Ecclesiastical Offices / according to the / Spirit of the Church / and the / Prescriptions of her Canons." This compensates, in the baptismal rite, for the omission of the English translations of prayers, and is more in accordance with the common liturgical law. The Instructions, with some modifications, remained in subsequent editions up to and excluding that of 1915, which has merely the *Recommendation of a Departing Soul* as an Appendix.

ADDITIONAL BEADS OF THE ROSARY

What is the origin and purpose of the additional three small and two large beads attached to the rosary in its present form? (W.)

REPLY

i. A search through the usual manuals being unsuccessful, a number of theological students were asked what they were accustomed to say

on these beads and why. The replies were nearly all different: a three-fold *Gloria Patri* or a three-fold *Ave* and one *Pater* or *Credo* at the end, or at the beginning, in honour of the Blessed Trinity, or for an increase of the three theological virtues, or for the Pope's intention, etc. Each one recorded what he had been taught as a child, or what the parish priest was accustomed to say in reciting the rosary in public. For the most part the answer was that the person said no prayers on these beads, and did not know what they were for, the point not having occurred to him.

One thing is certain: neither the complete and devout recitation of the rosary, nor the gaining of any indulgences attached thereto, requires anything whatever beyond the recitation of a *Pater* once and an *Ave* ten times for each decade, together with meditation on the mystery commemorated.

In our present use, additional prayers before or after do not violate the rule of canon 934, §2,¹ and they are to be commended, whatever idea one has of their nature and purpose. The statement sometimes met with that the *Credo Pater* and triple *Ave* are meant for those who cannot meditate, in order that the indulgences may be gained by saying these prayers instead, appears to be devoid of all foundation.² Accordingly, one may privately adopt any devotional use of these beads, and in the public recitation of the rosary continue whatever is customary in the locality.

ii. The devotional practice being so varied, some explanation is required of the fact that rosaries, for the last two or three centuries, always have a pendant of at least three small beads. The best explanation, though not absolutely conclusive, is that given by Fr. Thurston, S.J., in *The Month*, December 1900, p. 632. The Briggittine rosary, still in use, was extremely popular in the sixteenth century, consisting of six decades and three extra beads for the recitation sixty-three times of the *Ave*, in commemoration of the years traditionally assigned to Our Lady's Life.³ Arranged in this way a Briggittine rosary could be used also as a Dominican rosary, and at the present time the Briggittine indulgence may be attached to a rosary of five decades.⁴ The three extra small beads thus became very familiar in the construction of a rosary, and when the Briggittine form became less popular they were retained. The illustration of a Briggittine rosary given in *The Month*, August 1902, p. 202, contains only three small beads as a pendant. Of the two large beads now usual, one would correspond to the *Pater* due to a rosary whether of five or six decades, and the other large bead, very

¹ Fanfani, *De Rosario*, §3. THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1935, X, p. 306.

² *Ecclesiastical Review*, 1902, XXVII, p. 545.

³ For this devotion and indulgences attached, Cf. *Collationes Brugenses*, 1928, p. 216; Gougnard, *De Indulgentiis*, p. 226.

⁴ Gougnard, *op. cit.* p. 227.

likely, to the *Credo*; the crucifix is a fairly obvious pendant to a religious article, and some rosaries have the word *Credo* stamped upon it.

MASS IN DOMINICAN CHAPEL

May a secular priest, celebrating Mass in a chapel belonging to Dominican sisters, follow the diocesan Ordo, instead of that proper to Dominicans? Otherwise he may have to use two Missals. (V.)

REPLY

Addit. et Variat. IV, 6: Omnes et singuli Sacerdotes, tam saeculares quam regulares, Missas, etsi Regularium proprias, omnino celebrent iuxta Kalendarium Ecclesiae, vel Oratorii publici, in quo celebrant; exclusis tamen peculiaribus ritibus Ordinum et Ecclesiarum propriis. Idem servetur in Oratorio semipublico. . . .

S.R.C., 4 June, 1934: (1) Habentne Sorores III Ordinis S. Dominici in communi viventes privilegium utendi Kalendario proprio Ordinis S. Dominici? *Resp.* Affirmative.

(3) Si sacerdotes earum Kalendarium sequi teneantur, quodnam Missale adhibendum est, si Missa propria, quae in Missali Romano non est, sed in Missali Ordinis S. Dominici tantum invenitur, dicenda est? Et quodnam Missale iterum adhibendum est, si Missa invenitur in utroque Missali, nempe in Romano et in Proprio Ordinis, et aliqua commemoratio facienda est, quae eodem die in Missali Ordinis tantum invenitur? Sufficitne ut talis commemoratio ex communi Missalis Romani fiat? *Resp.* Sive quoad Missas sive quoad commemorationes in Missis faciendas Sacerdotes utantur Missali proprio Ordinis Praedicatorum, exclusis tamen peculiaribus ritibus eiusdem Ordinis propriis, iuxta novas Missalis Romani Rubricas, tit. iv, n. 6 (Private Reply. *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1934, VIII, p. 327).

This question has been fully discussed in the past pages of this *REVIEW*, 1933, VI, p. 323; 1934, VIII, pp. 62 and 327. Since the matter is often recurring the conclusions are summarized again, and they apply not only to the chapels of Dominican sisters but to all churches and chapels which enjoy the privilege of a Kalendar distinct from that of the diocese in which the chapel is situated. The private reply, *S.R.C.*, 4 June, 1934, was communicated to us by Right Rev. Mgr. Arnoz, Prefect Apostolic of Bulawayo.

On the principle that Mass must be celebrated according to the Kalendar of the church, a visiting secular priest must obey this rule, and there will be no difficulty whatever if the community, though having a proper Kalendar, uses the Roman Missal for the *Ordo Missae*.

If, in addition to a proper Kalendar, the community also enjoys

the use of rite differing in some particulars from that of the *Ordo Missae* in the Roman Missal, the problem is how to avoid the necessity of using two Missals, one for the *Ordo Missae* and the other for the Mass proper to the community; for there is a very stringent law, expressed in canon 819, requiring priests to celebrate Mass according to their own rite, and no secular priest may, for any reason, say Mass with rites proper to the Dominicans.

One solution is that a separate Missal for the *Ordo Missae* is not really necessary, since the differences are slight, and the secular priest will know by heart the *Ordo Missae* which he is bound to follow. Another very good suggestion, made by Fr. Lattey, S.J., is that the Roman *Ordo Missae* should be bound into a Dominican Missal, for the convenience of priests who have to use it. If neither of these solutions is accepted, it will be necessary for reading the Canon of the Mass, to change the Dominican for a Roman Missal.

TRIDUUM OF HOLY WEEK IN CONVENT CHAPELS

Assuming that the Institution must reserve the Blessed Sacrament for the sick, what is the correct place for so doing in chapels which have only one tabernacle suitably constructed for reserving the ciborium, namely that on the main altar? Some maintain that, if this tabernacle is used, the chapel must be closed until after the Mass on Holy Saturday. (Z.)

REPLY

S.C. Sacram., 26 March, 1929, *A.A.S.*, xxi, 631. III, b.:

Pro Communionem infirmis danda, in Ecclesiis parochialibus, aliisque, a quibus accipi solet Sanctissima Eucharistia, servandae sunt aliquae particulae consecratae in pyxide, circa cujus repositionem haec servantur. Juxta mentem Rubricarum ista extra Ecclesiam esset reponenda, sc. prope Sacristiam, in loco opportuno et apto, ubi congrua cum reverentia adservandum erit Sacramentum, non tamen fidelium adorationi expositum, sed tantum, communionem infirmis ministrandi causa custoditum. Hujusmodi locus opportunus et aptus est capella, seu sacellum prope Ecclesiam, vel ipsum sacrarium, aut aliquod parvum conclave sacrarii tutum et decens; aut etiam locus decens in parochiali domo, a domesticis et profanis usibus sejunctus, et a quocumque irreverentiae periculo remotus. Ibi parandum est tabernaculum clave obserandum, lampade coram eodem jugiter ardente, et repositio ipsa Feria V facienda est.

Ubi vero hujusmodi aptus locus non habeatur, sacra pyxis adservanda erit a Missa Feriae V ad Missam Praesantificatorum ipso in "Sepulcro", uti communiter appellatur, post calicem; a celebrata

autem Missa Praesantificationum ad Missam Sabbati Sancti, in aliqua remotiore et secretiore capella ecclesiae, ibique lampas accensa maneat. Si autem nullus, praeter "sepulcri" sacellum, locus aptus habeatur, pyxis in ipso sepulcro, usque ad Sabbatum Sanctum remaneat. Lampas ante Sepulcrum accendatur, extinctis ceteris luminibus, iis etiam sublati, quae ad ipsius ornatum fuerunt apposita. Quod si in aliqua ecclesia Coenae Domini solemnities non habeantur, sacra pyxis suo in altari servari poterit usque ad solis occasum ejusdem Feriae V; posthac usque ad Sabbatum Sanctum, in aliquem ex supra indicatis locis erit collocanda.

Prudentiae ceteroquin Episcoporum erit, quoties enascatur difficultas in harum praescriptionum observantia, quaenam sint aptiora loca ex enunciatis ad eundem finem, dijudicare, et si non parvi super eadem re irrepererint abusus, ut sedulo isti removeantur, curare.

The directions given in the Instruction of 1929 repeat, with more detail, the rubrics contained in the new edition (1921) of the *Memoriale Rituum*, IV, ii, §3, 4, and V, ii, §5, 1,¹ and they replace any earlier instructions found in ritual books.

The obvious comment one has to make on the difficulty set out in the above question is that an Institution which has the privilege of reserving the Blessed Sacrament throughout the year should also have everything essential for observing the law during the last three days of Holy Week. It should have another receptacle for the Blessed Sacrament, constructed according to the rules summarized in *S.C. Sacram.*, 26 May, 1938,² which may serve for the custody of the Blessed Sacrament at this season. The Instruction offers many alternatives including the sacristy and, if there is absolutely no other suitable place, the chapel used for the Altar of Repose.

If the Institution, as is likely, does not observe the ceremonies of Holy Week, the above directions are nevertheless to be observed: the Blessed Sacrament may remain till sunset on Holy Thursday in the Tabernacle of the main altar, and should then be removed.

The decree itself leaves it to the Ordinary to make any further directions which may be required. It seems to us a curious procedure to close the chapel on one of the most sacred days of the year, but this may be the Ordinary's decision; or, what is more likely, he may direct that the Blessed Sacrament should not be reserved, if there is no suitable provision; he may even tolerate the use of the tabernacle of the main altar, whilst the faithful use the chapel for the Stations and other religious exercises: the sanctuary could be veiled off so as to exclude public veneration of the Holy Eucharist.

E. J. M.

¹ The English version of V, ii, §5, 1, should read, more correctly, "to this place" instead of "from here": "secus huc asportata esset eodem die".

² Cf. THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1938, XV, p. 170.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

PONTIFICIA COMMISSIO AD CODICIS CANONES
AUTHENTICE INTERPRETANDOS

RESPONSA AD PROPOSITA DUBIA (A.A.S., 1945, XXXVII, p. 149)

Emi Patres Pontificiae Commissionis ad Codicis canones authenticè interpretandos, propositis in plenario coetu quae sequenter dubiis, respondendum mandarunt ut infra ad singula:

I—DE PROVISIONE PAROECIARUM

D. An sub verbis: *peculiaria locorum ac personarum adiuncta*, de quibus in canone 458, veniant quoque necessitates oeconomicae dioecesis.

R. Negative.

II—DE FORMA CELEBRATIONIS MATRIMONII

D. Utrum grave incommodum, de quo in canone 1098, sit tantum illud quod imminet parrocho vel Ordinario vel sacerdoti delegato qui matrimonio assistant, an etiam illud quod imminet utrique vel alterutri matrimonium contrahenti.

R. Negative ad primam partem, affirmative ad secundam.

III—DE IURE ACCUSANDI MATRIMONIUM

D. An coniugi, inhabili ad accusandum matrimonium ad normam canonis 1971, §1 n. 1, competat ius appellandi vel recurrendi adversus sententiam in favorem matrimonii latam.

R. Negative, salvo extraiudicialibus recursibus.

Datum Romae, e Civitate Vaticana, die 3 mensis Maii, anno 1945.

CARD. M. MASSIMI, Praeses.

Ad II. Canon 1098 provides for the form of marriage with witnesses alone, whenever a competent priest cannot be present, "si haberi vel adiri nequeat sine gravi incommodo". Former replies defining the situation are:

Code Commission, 10 November, 1925, viii; Bouscaren, *Digest*, I, p. 542.

Code Commission, 10 March, 1928, i; Bouscaren, *Digest*, I, p. 542.

Code Commission, 25 July, 1931; Bouscaren, *Digest*, I, p. 542; THE

CLERGY REVIEW, 1931, II, p. 447.

S.C.Sacram., 24 April, 1935 (private); Bouscaren, *Digest*, II, p. 336;
THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1938, XIV, p. 367.

A full discussion of the whole question, both before and after the promulgation of the Code, by Dr. G. Oesterle, O.S.B., may be seen in *Jus Pontificium*, 1928, VIII, p. 174, and 1929, IX, p. 141.

Ad III. Canon 1971, §1, n. 1, declares that the party to a marriage who is the cause of an impediment is barred from accusing the marriage in an ecclesiastical court. The law is restated in Art. 37 of the Instruction for Diocesan Tribunals, *S.C.Sacram.* 15 August, 1936, together with the *Code Commission* replies given before that date. Various decisions subsequent to the Instruction are in Bouscaren, *Digest*, II, p. 542. Under certain conditions a marriage of this kind may be accused judicially, not indeed by the party responsible for the alleged nullity of the contract, but by the *promotor iustitiae* as in Art. 37, §4, of the Instruction.

In the event of a decision in the court of first instance against the validity of the marriage, the *defensor vinculi* must appeal to a court of second instance; in the event of a decision for the validity of the marriage, it is the *promotor iustitiae* who appeals, not the party responsible for the alleged nullity, a necessary conclusion from the rule which excludes him from accusing the marriage in the court of first instance; cf. Instruction, Art. 212. The force of the present reply is that, if the *promotor iustitiae* decides not to appeal, the party in question may have recourse to the Ordinary or to the Holy See about the grievance *modo administrativo* merely.

E. J. M.

BOOK REVIEWS

Weapons for Peace. By Thomas P. Neill. Demy 8vo., pp. ix + 234.
 (The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee. \$2.50.)

AGAIN and again, since the end of the war, in these days of apparently futile political and diplomatic negotiation, with the shadow of disillusion sweeping over the West, it becomes increasingly obvious that men do not know the meaning of peace. War they grew to understand, and they adapted themselves to its needs. But peace, in a positive and constructive way, they cannot grasp. Mr. Neill has made a courageous and helpful attempt to help them to do so in a book which is the fruit

of study, of personal thought, and of the assimilation of Papal teaching for the past ten years.

Beginning with a bold insistence on the value and importance of personal thinking and personal decision in this era of democracy, Mr. Neill emphasizes the special position which the Catholic occupies as a promoter of peace in the world of today. The Catholic knows—or should know—both what to aim at and how to go about attaining it. He should not fall into the pessimism of disillusion nor into the ingenuous optimism of the “dawnist” visionaries. And precisely because he has this balanced view of life and of the capabilities and weaknesses of human nature, the Catholic has a very real responsibility to his fellow men. On the Catholics of today and tomorrow, in fact, depends the prospect of peace.

“Indeed,” writes Mr. Neill, “it is as a member of his Church, it is by reason of his heritage and his immediate contact through the Church with the tradition on which Western civilization was built, that the Catholic should be the ideal mediator for peace. More than anyone else he should be in a position to solve the basic problems of peace, since he, above all others, should recognize and comprehend them. He should reverence man for his true worth; he should have respect for the meanest of men, for the most despicable person on earth. But at the same time he should realize better than anyone else how prone the best of men are to wickedness and violence, how there is good and bad in each of us. He alone should understand how man’s very nature cries for freedom and deserves it. But better than anyone else he should know how necessary government is and how it must be armed with adequate power. In short, he should have the key, in a correct knowledge of man’s nature, to the problem of reconciling freedom and authority, and thus affording man human freedom without denying him the security his fallen nature so pitifully needs.”

An understanding of the “crisis of the West”, however, depends, in the first place, on an understanding of the history of Europe in the last five hundred years; and a sketch of this history Mr. Neill attempts in the Second Part of his book. It is a brief and condensed sketch, dealing mainly with the movement of ideas. But it is essentially correct, the emphasis is right, the proportions just. Mr. Neill does not lay all the blame on the Reformation. He shows how much the Renaissance was a preparation, a mould almost in which the life of modern Europe was cast.

“Of all the changes occurring in this period known as the Renaissance,” he notes, “the most important was the change within men’s souls. Man’s system of values was completely rearranged so that religion came to be secondary to worldly concerns. A completely new attitude towards life was developed whereby God, though not formally denied, was pushed aside until death closed in on the individual. Man

treated this life as an end in itself rather than the means to life eternal, as it had been in medieval days. The attitude of the age was summed up tersely in this frequently repeated declaration: 'I seek my immortality in the memory of posterity'. Thus was tranquillity lost and order destroyed; thus did peace of heart and mind disappear."

Mr. Neill goes on to show that the French Revolution and the modern age of the "isms" have merely made the problem worse, and that the remedies suggested in our own days—the Nazi and Communist "solutions"—are, if anything, worse than the disease.

With Chapter VIII, entitled "Back to Sanity", we come to the constructive part of the book. Here we get, vigorously and justly presented, the Papal conception of peace as an organic whole—peace in the consciences of men, peace in the nation, peace among the nations. The ideal is admirably set forth. Mr. Neill is not concerned, however, merely with the ideal, but with the means by which it may be translated into reality. The use of these means depends eventually upon individual decisions, and Mr. Neill ends his book on the note with which he opened, with a strong and urgent appeal to Catholics to recognize and accept their responsibility towards the peace of the world. He has written a book which should be read—by the clergy as well as by the laity.

A. B.

The War and the Vatican. By Camille M. Cianfarra. Demy 8vo., pp. 344. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 10s. 6d.)

THIS is a very interesting, instructive, lively, but slightly superficial piece of good journalism. Mr. Cianfarra was the *New York Times* correspondent in Rome during the last months of the Pontificate of Pope Pius XI, and during the fifteen months of the reign of the present Holy Father, until the entry of Italy into the war, and Mussolini's declaration of war against the United States. His book is a very successful attempt on the part of a trained onlooker to give a picture of the attitude and activity of the Vatican during the period of growing international tension which marked the transition from peace to war in Europe.

Mr. Cianfarra writes with an eye on his American public, and for those who know little of the work of the Papacy or the life of the Vatican. He fills in the background to his picture with an excellent account of the history and working of the Vatican City State, and of the organization of the government of the Church. His account of the diplomatic moves and of Papal policy produces three very marked impressions. In the first place he shows clearly and vividly how much Pope Pius XII did in the six months of his Pontificate, before the storm of war broke loose, to preserve and to protect peace, and how all his efforts were

nullified by the attitude of Hitler and the Nazi government. The complete incompatibility of Catholicism with National Socialism might be called the core of the book. He dwells also, however, on the Italian situation, and while exposing and condemning the cynical opportunism of Mussolini, brings out the essential goodness of the Italian people, driven sheep-like and, on the whole, unwilling into war. Quite remarkably he minimizes the Papal strictures on the Italian Abyssinian campaign, and, possibly with an eye on his public, adopts an anti-Franco attitude with regard to the Spanish civil war, using the titles "Loyalists" and "Rebels" to describe the two sides. Finally he emphasizes the fact that Pope Pius XII will support the moderate policy so far pursued by this country and the United States in pursuit of peace. There is a fine tribute to the work of the Pope in the summer of 1939: "During July and August, the Pontiff set aside every other problem to concentrate exclusively on diplomatic activity. He never, until the last day, desisted from his efforts. His work to save Europe and the world from the ravages of war, although it was not successful, will undoubtedly remain as one of the outstanding contributions to peace given by a single man in our century. His great intelligence and profound diplomatic experience was coupled with a truly amazing sense of balance, knowledge of problems and a realism that were unmatched by any of the European statesmen."

The book shows all the strength and weakness of American journalism. Good backgrounds, clever and colourful descriptions, exact definitions, titles and names abound. There is a fine account, for instance, of the summoning of Cardinal Innitzer to the Vatican, of Hitler's visit to Mussolini in Rome, of the Italian reaction to the Anschluss—and of Mussolini's forty-two bows on the occasion of the proclamation of the Italian Ethiopian Empire. But there is little deep analysis of Papal policy, and little indication of the extraordinary breadth, co-ordination and completeness of the Papal plan for peace. There is an attempt to summarize the contents of the Pope's Christmas Eve messages, but, in the main, this is a journalist's account of Papal diplomatic activity rather than a student's presentation of Papal teaching.

A. B.

The Third Day. By Arnold Lunn. Demy 8vo., pp. xxxv + 145. (Burns Oates. 10s. 6d.)

To have included within the covers of a book of little more than 70,000 words a powerful plea for an unbiassed consideration of the Christian claims, as well as chapters on the rational approach to the question of miracles, on the miracles of Lourdes, on the internal and external evidence for the historicity of the gospels, on the Resurrection of Christ

and the attempts of anti-miraculists to explain it away, on Modernism and on Spiritism—this is not only a *tour de force* which the publishers are possibly right in describing as unique; it is also a task which the diffidence of the majority of apologists would have forbidden them even to attempt. There is thus some truth in Mr. Lunn's saying that "Christian apologists are too apologetic". I should prefer myself to put it in another way and to suggest that the Church needs apologists of two kinds: those who forge the weapons and those who wield them. The Church needs those scholars of silent and retiring habit whose philosophical studies establish the metaphysical basis for the science of apologetics; she needs the biblical scholars and historians whose patient research vindicates the historical value of early Christian sources. These are the munition workers of apologetics, and their labours are seen only by the few. But the Church needs also the fighting apologist, who can make public and effective use of the conclusions established by the specializing student; who knows the mentality of the unbeliever and appreciates his taste for downright assertion, his impatience with philosophical subtleties and his inability to follow any profound metaphysical reasoning; who is quick to seize upon the damaging admissions of his opponents, judicious in his use of unbiased testimony, and able to sum up a convincing case with lucidity and force. It is here that Mr. Lunn excels and herein lies the value of this book. Technical manuals of apologetic may perhaps be more intellectually satisfying to the student. But to the great public whom Mr. Lunn addresses *The Third Day* will make the more effective appeal.

G. D. S.

The Study of St. Athanasius. An Inaugural Lecture delivered before the University of Oxford on 1 December, 1944. By F. L. Cross, Late Margaret Professor of Divinity. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 2s.)

MR. CROSS's lecture deserves wider notice than its scope and circumstances are likely to afford if only for its opening paragraphs, which give a brilliantly brief and forceful exposition of the excellence of the monastic life for co-operative scholarship. This accompanies a short account of the Maurist congregation, founders of modern scientific history and one of the brightest ornaments of that French golden age. An illustration, at random, of how little piety English academic historians in general have felt towards their origins may be found in the fact that Ogg's *Europe in the Seventeenth Century*, still the best-known textbook on this period, contains no single reference in its "General Culture" chapter to St. Maur, to Mabillon or Montfaucon—though it is well larded with references to Spinoza, Galileo, the Jesuits, Casuistry and Tyrannicide. These paragraphs are not the only thing in Mr. Cross's lecture to invite the reflection that Stendhal's famous gibe: "It

takes eighty years for anything to reach the general public" was far too conservative.

Mr. Cross pays generous tribute to the Catholic origins of Athanasian scholarship, and is able also to mention one or two modern Catholic contributions in the same field; yet one is left with a feeling of regret that Catholic scholars (at least in England) are no longer taking a prominent part in a work which by right is pre-eminently theirs. In particular one would like to see someone take up Mr. Trevor Jalland's challenge, adumbrated in *The Church and the Papacy*, to the traditional view of the saint's character and motives—a challenge especially remarkable in view of Mr. Cross's insistence on the inconclusive and fluid nature of the present stage of Athanasian studies.

W. A. P.

Christ Unconquered. By Arthur Little, S.J. (Browne & Nolan. 10s. 6d.)

FR. LITTLE has written a very impressive poem—an epic of more than 6000 lines—divided into ten books. I do not mean that it is impressive merely in its bulk. It is impressive in its treatment of its great theme: the betrayal, trial and sufferings of Our Lord, and the conflict of ideas and feelings among the various actors in that supreme drama. Fr. Little bases himself firmly on the Gospel narrative, with the liberty of a little fiction here and there, as when he identifies the woman taken in adultery with the Magdalen, or represents the good thief as terror-stricken at the prospect of his execution. He treats Annas, Pilate and the rest, not merely as individuals, but as representing the types of mind who are always with us and always hostile or indifferent, for various motives, to the teaching and the work of God.

The publishers advertise the poem as being of Miltonic stature. But Milton is unique and alone in his grandeur. It is much easier to read Milton than to read Fr. Little. Ease and clarity of diction, with the apparently effortless fitting of the right words to the thoughts, are among the marks of the very greatest writers in prose or verse. Fr. Little does not reach that supreme standard. He is rugged and rough-hewn in comparison with the chiselled grace of Milton. He is at times obscure. You feel not rarely that his words have not come living from his mind as the inspired expression of his thoughts, but are picked up and fitted in, and are therefore artificial. But at other times he is a true poet, as in Pilate's discourse in Book VI, or in the line which closes the description of the Crucifixion:

And it was noon,
Noon of that day and the whole vast of time.

Even the most fastidious critic could not quarrel with the beauty of that line.

Fr. Little's mind and imagination are steeped in the scenes which he describes; and, whatever be the final verdict on his work as poetry, he succeeds in bringing those scenes very vividly before the reader's mind. Perhaps this hurrying age is not patient of the long-drawn pace of epics. But any reader who works meditatively through Fr. Little's courageous *opus magnum* will have his spirit enlarged and ennobled.

J. C.

White Fire. By the Rev. E. J. Edwards, S.V.D. Pp. 216. (Burns Oates. 8s. 6d.)

RELIGIOUS vocation partakes of the nature of a mystery, and consequently is not easily understood, even by Catholics. Many people were puzzled that one so young and attractive as Sister Agnes Marie should feel herself called to spend her life in a leper colony, although the only one to be angered over it was the sceptical Dr. Hewitt. In due time, however, he changed his views. Seeing is believing: and seeing the miraculous brings the faith of conviction.

The author of this thrilling story does not spare his readers when it comes to describing what leprosy really means. Unless he spoke plainly of the disease we should hardly appreciate the heroic self-sacrifice of those who devote themselves to the victims of this most dreaded of all afflictions. Strangely enough at the end of the tale dread and horror have disappeared, and the almost imperceptible glow of light—felt rather than seen, from the very first page of the book—has finally radiated into a positive glory. It transfigures priests, nuns, doctors, patients, and even the whisky-smelling "Dad Hogan" himself, despite Sister Agnes Marie's repugnance to him upon his first appearance.

Novels from Catholic writers, including writers of the first rank, are frequently spoiled by the authors' un-Catholic treatment of their subject, as occasional letters of protest in the Catholic Press readily testify. Here is the brilliant exception. It has all that one looks for in a work of fiction, character-drawing, humour, pathos and the rest; but from first to last it is thoroughly Catholic. Fr. Edwards has produced an excellent story, everywhere true to life.

L. T. H.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE BIRTH-PLACE OF ST. BEDE

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1945, XXV, p. 510)

The Rev. S. Landreth, of Venerable Bede Vicarage, Monkwearmouth, writes:

In his table of the life of St. Bede, Dom Romanus Rios, O.S.B., begins: "673. Born at Jarrow." This is, of course, in accordance with a strong tradition, which has the support of the Breviary (27 May, Lesson 4). But it is only fair to point out that there is another tradition, accepted by some modern historians, that Bede was born in Sunderland, on the south bank of the Wear, opposite Monkwearmouth.

Bede's own statement is that he was born "in territorio eiusdem monasterii". If this means land which had been transferred to St. Benedict Biscop at the time of his birth, it may refer to Wearmouth, but cannot refer to Jarrow, where the grant was not made till some years later. If it means land which afterwards belonged to the monastery, it may, of course, refer to either place. It is interesting to note that the Anglo-Saxon version of Bede's History, attributed to King Alfred the Great, translates the above phrase as "on sundurlonde thaes ylcan mynstres". This is significant, but hardly conclusive.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

o
e
o
r
-
n
c.
l,
e
r-
e
g
es